BX
5199
.P45
A4
1934

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
OCT 14 1940
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BX 5199 .P45 A4 1934
Peckham, John Laimbeer, 1892
-
Archbishop Peckham as a
religious educator

Archbishop Peckham as a Religious Educator

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
OCT 14 1940
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

YALE STUDIES IN RELIGION

Number 7

Historical Monograph

ARCHBISHOP PECKHAM AS A RELIGIOUS EDUCATOR

by

JOHN LAIMBEER PECKHAM

The Mennonite Publishing House

Scottdale, Pennsylvania

1934

NEW HAVEN

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON · HUMPHREY MILFORD · OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Printed in the United States of America

Copyright, 1934

By the author.

Printed March 1934

Copies (Paper, $1.00; Cloth, $1.50) may be obtained by addressing the author, care The Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut

"Ignorantia Sacerdotum populum praecipitat in foveam erroris."

"Ignorantia subditorum est dampnatio negligentium praelatorum."

—*John Peckham.*

PREFACE

JOHN PECKHAM occupied the primatial throne of Canterbury from 1279 to 1292. During these years he exerted upon religious education an influence which has hitherto been difficult to appraise. Yet this influence can be traced throughout a period of more than two centuries and can be demonstrated by means of ecclesiastical legislation and clerical manuals preserved in manuscripts and early collections in the libraries of Oxford, Cambridge, Lambeth Palace, the British Museum and elsewhere.

This evidence, here presented, is limited to his work performed while Archbishop, but it justifies a new evaluation of his importance as a religious educator. Ideally, the skills of the Medievalist, the Latinist, the student of Scholastic Philosophy, and the expert in Canon Law ought to be possessed by one who would essay a complete delineation of Peckham's life and influence. To such a combination of techniques the present writer lays no claim, and he gratefully acknowledges here the assistance which he has received from others.

From the Reverend Ernest Lewellyn Ackley he has received invaluable aid in connection with manuscripts and books to be found only in certain English libraries. From Professor A. G. Little of Sevenoaks, Kent, and from Professor Francis William Buckler of the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology he has received technical assistance at more than one point. From the Reverend Professor Robert Lowry Calhoun of Yale he has received gracious guidance and encouragement throughout the investigation. The results of this study were presented, originally with greater detail, to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Yale University as partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Education.

For permission to use copyrighted material the writer is indebted to Macmillan & Co., Ltd., the Manchester University Press, and Methuen & Co., Ltd.

John L. Peckham.

CONTENTS

Introduction

PART ONE

Peckham's Work

Chap.		Page
I.	With the Monasteries	18
II.	With the Secular Clergy	31
III.	At Oxford University	44
IV.	On Behalf of the Laity	49

PART TWO

Peckham's Influence

V.	Upon Ecclesiastical Legislation	83
VI.	Upon Clerical Manuals	98
VII.	Upon Curricula, &c.	114

PART THREE

Peckham's Importance

VIII.	Evaluation of His Work	116
IX.	Appraisal of His Influence	133
	Appendices	141
	Bibliography	144
	Analysis of Contents	147

ARCHBISHOP PECKHAM AS A RELIGIOUS EDUCATOR

With the details of Peckham's life prior to his consecration as Archbishop of Canterbury this study is not primarily concerned. These facts have already been set forth elsewhere[1] in as great detail as existing data seem to justify. For the purpose of providing a background to this present study, his life prior to his elevation to the episcopate may be summed up briefly as follows:—

John Peckham[2] was born in England, probably in Kent[3] or in Sussex[4], between the years 1210[5] and 1240[6], and received his early education at the priory of Lewes in Sussex[7]. From there he probably[8] went to Oxford, where he may have been a pupil of Adam Marsh, who speaks of him in favorable terms and states that Peckham, having entered the Franciscan Order, had resigned his post as tutor to the nephew of H. de Andegavia.

Peckham later went to Paris, where he came under the influence of St. Bonaventura, took his degree as doctor and "ruled in theology", having among his pupils Thomas de Cantelupe, afterwards the sainted Bishop of Hereford. At Paris, Peckham met St. Thomas Aquinas, and was present when the latter submitted his doctrine of the "Unity of Form" to the judgment of the masters in theology there[9].

---

1 By Hook, in *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury,* vol. iii, pp. 327-67; by Kingsford, in *The Dictionary of National Biography, s. v.* Peckham, John; and by Martin, in the extensive Preface of his *Registrum Epistolarum Fratris Johannis Peckham* (hereafter referred to as *Reg.*) in the Rolls Series (1882-5).

2 For various spellings of the name, see Appendix I.

3 Cf. Lampen: *Jean Pecham, O. F. M., et son Office de la S. Trinité,* in "La France Franciscaine", tome xi, p. 212.

4 Cf. *Fr. Johannis Pecham . . . Tractatus tres de Paupertate* (Kingsford, Little, Tocco, editors) being Brit. Soc. Franciscan Studies, vol. ii, p. v.

5 Cf. Lampen, *op. cit.,* p. 212f.

6 See Hook, *op. cit.,* p. 328f. But (in view of Peckham's elevation to the Primacy in 1279) an earlier date than 1240 would seem more probable. Hook is uncritical and more "popular" than scholarly. (London, 1860-76.)

7 *Reg.,* p. 902.

8 Cf. *Fr. Johannis Pecham . . . Tractatus tres de Paupertate,* p. v: "The chronology of John Pecham's life before he became archbishop remains obscure."

9 *Reg.,* pp. 866 and 899.

About 1270, Peckham returned to Oxford, became a lector of his Order, and a few years later was elected the Provincial Minister of the Franciscans in England. While holding this office, he travelled to Padua to attend the General Chapter of the Order being held in that city.

A year or two later, he was summoned to Rome by the pope and was made "Lector sacri palatii",[10] a position which he held until his elevation to the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury in 1279. It was probably during this period,[11] *i. e.*, while a lecturer in Paris, Oxford and Rome, that he had leisure to compose numerous theological,[12] philosophical, and scientific treatises, a complete list of which can probably be constructed by combining the bibliography given in the *Tractatus tres de Paupertate*[13] with the additional data presented in Little's recent article in the *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*.[14]

While at Rome, Peckham gained considerable fame. His lectures were attended by many bishops and cardinals, who always arose and uncovered when he entered to deliver his lecture—a mark of respect which the cardinals refused to continue after he was nominated to the archbishopric, lest the meaning of the act be misconstrued.[15]

After Peckham assumed the duties of archbishop, there is no positive evidence that he found himself able to continue his work as a writer, and (as far as can be determined from the MS. evidence) all his treatises were composed at a time prior to his assumption of the purple. Few of his works can be dated with any accuracy; but in the case of one of the treatises which can be assigned with some certainty to a definite period, the evidence[16] seems to require its composition prior to the year 1270. It is quite possible that his other works belong to the years 1258 to 1278, *i. e.*, to the period preceding his elevation to the see of Canterbury.

---

[10] See *Fr. Johannis Pecham . . . Tractatus tres de Paupertate, loc. cit.*

[11] Cf. Lampen, *op. cit.*, p. 216.

[12] Even his Office for Trinity Sunday was probably written before he became archbishop, for the observance of this festival by his Order was suppressed in 1279, the very year of his accession to the Primacy. See Lampen, *op. cit.*, p. 221; Batiffol: *History of the Roman Breviary*, pp. 134 and note 5, 166 and note 3, and 252. For its later history, see Martin, in *Reg.*, vol. iii, pp. lxxix f. and cii; Lampen, *op. cit.*, p. 221f.; and *Fr. Johannis Pecham . . . Tractatus tres de Paupertate*, p. 4.

[13] A bibliography covering eleven pages, *viz.*, pp. 1-12.

[14] *The Franciscan School at Oxford in the Thirteenth Century;* in vol. xix (1926), pp. 803-74, especially p. 852.

[15] Cf. Lampen, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

[16] Ably summed up by Kingsford in *Fr. Johannis Pecham . . . Tractatus tres*, &c., pp. 148-54. For other works, see Little, A. G., *loc. cit.*, p. 853.

Paris, Oxford, Rome—these serve to indicate the richness of the background against which Peckham's work as Archbishop must be projected. It has not been possible to delineate with precision the details of these influences upon his later activities as archbishop. His popularity with the Pope, whose favor placed him in positions of importance, and who ultimately secured for him the archiepiscopal dignity, would probably indicate that Peckham had enthusiastically espoused the policies of the Pope. This, in turn, would largely influence his program as archbishop. Other possible lines of continental influence would be Peckham's contacts with other prelates in Italy and with various ecclesiastics at Paris, e. g., Bonaventura and Aquinas.[17] His membership in the Franciscan Order and his deep loyalty to its ideals account adequately for many of his attitudes, requirements, and labors while occupant of the see of Canterbury. Beneath the robes of the archbishop, Peckham wore —at least figuratively and perhaps literally—the simple habit of the Friar, which accounts, at least in part, for his Lambeth preaching requirements, and for his constant emphasis upon simplicity of life, poverty, chastity and obedience.[18]

Problems confronting the new Archbishop

Peckham's position as Primate was rendered difficult in two ways—he was confronted by a grave financial problem, and he had not been the king's choice. On reaching Canterbury, Peckham found himself facing a financial embarrassment as serious as it was unexpected. His predecessor in office, Robert Kilwardby, had sold the last year's revenues of the see and had taken away much valuable property. Peckham was therefore without the means to discharge the debts which his appointment to the office had incurred. He even tried[19] unsuccessfully to recover the property which Kilwardby had misappropriated, for he was hard pressed by his Italian creditors for the four thousand marks which he had been forced to borrow to provide for the forms involved in his election, the costly complimentary visits to the cardinals, and the expenses of his journey to England. The Italian bankers were becoming so urgent that, archbishop though he was, he seemed to fear that he might incur excommunication for the default of the payment.

---

[17] These constitute matters which seem to await further investigation. It is possible that there are manuscripts in Italy or Paris which would supply data of considerable significance, e. g., the influence of the Council of Lyons (1274) upon Peckham.

[18] His attitude toward the Virgin Mary, characteristic of the Franciscans, will be later noted in an indulgence.

[19] *Reg.*, pp. 227 and 550.

In the second place, Peckham had not been the king's choice. Edward had been anxious to secure the archbishopric for his Chancellor, Robert Burnell, whose private life was shadowed by grave scandals but whose influence would always be cast upon the side of the Crown. Edward had taken personal pains to secure Burnell's election by the Chapter of Canterbury, but the Pope had quashed[20] the election and refused to sanction the appointment.

This irked the king greatly, for at this time ecclesiastical preferment was regarded as the natural reward for trusted servants of the Crown—Chancellor and Treasurer were nearly always dignitaries of the church. What should be the limits of the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical and of the civil courts was still a burning issue. From the beginning, their respective spheres of influence had never been logically defined nor rigidly maintained. Each archbishop, bishop, archdeacon, and chapter of the rural dean had a separate court, separate system of citations, peculiar methods of purgation, penance and excommunication quite distinct from the procedure of the civil government.

The church's sphere was wide and ill-defined; in many cases it could deal with immoralities, cases of matrimony, probate and testamentary matters. On the other hand, the lay courts were watchful to repel aggression and often issued writs of prohibition seriously limiting the prerogatives of the clergy. These over-lapping jurisdictions raised problems of the gravest nature, and the king had wanted to strengthen his own position by having his dependable servant Burnell appointed to the archiepiscopal office.

But Pope Nicholas nominated Peckham to the vacant see on January 25, 1279, and a few weeks later consecrated him archbishop, probably[21] on February 19th., the First Sunday in Lent. On May 21, Peckham reached Amiens, where he met King Edward, who received him kindly and at once ordered that the temporalities of Canterbury be delivered to the new primate. On June 4, Peckham crossed from Witsand to Dover, but postponed his enthronization until October 8, when the king was able to be present.

Peckham was naturally inclined to favor the pretensions of the papal see[22] and his tenure of office was to be marked by several bold attempts to magnify ecclesiastical authority at the expense of the temporal. Edward I was a born ruler, and conflicts were in-

---

20 *Flores Historiarum* (edition of 1570), p. 366 says the election *quassabatur;* and Thomas Walsingham, in *Historia Anglicana* (London, 1863-4), vol. i, p. 19, says *electione cassata.*

21 But see Stubbs, *Reg. Sacr. Angl.* (2nd. ed.), p. 65.

22 *Reg.*, p. 240.

evitable between him and such a primate as Peckham. Very early Peckham was to set forth in a lengthy letter[23] the superior claims of the spiritual authority, drawing his arguments from Scripture and from precedents established in British, Saxon, and early Norman times. But the days of Hildebrand were over, and the high-flown appeal fell somewhat flat. The occasion of this letter had had its origin in one of those very conflicts between king and primate which seemed inevitable, viz., the question of visitatorial rights.

This question of visitatorial rights was but one phase of the larger problem of ill-defined jurisdictions with which the new primate was confronted. Though realizing that he was not the king's choice, Peckham refrained from seeking the king's favor by any act or concession which would seem detrimental to the dignity of his see or prejudicial to its ancient rights, especially its visitatorial rights. Though not the king's choice, Peckham would never become his servitor, and friction was bound to arise.

The situation in England was this: Each primate journeyed from time to time throughout his whole province, holding inquiries in cathedral chapters, religious houses, collegiate churches and elsewhere, listening to complaints and correcting faults and mismanagement. Bishops went through their respective dioceses in like manner, and archdeacons and rural deans made rounds in their narrower districts. An archbishop travelled in great state. The Lateran Council of 1179 had ruled[24] that they could have not more than 40 or 50 horsemen, that bishops could have only 30, archdeacons 5 to 7, and rural deans only 2. To entertain an archbishop was therefore a matter involving considerable expense, and efforts were often made to resist or evade such an onerous visitor. Thus Peckham in 1280 already found it necessary to issue a solemn warning[25] against certain malicious persons who were threatening to oppose his visitation of the diocese of Lichfield, and later, at St. David's, he had to sweep aside the pleas and demurs of a discontented and unwilling suffragan.[26]

In theory, the bishop's right of visitation extended to all churches and religious houses in his diocese, and the archbishop's right extended to all within his province; but there were many rec-

---

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 239f. See Prynne's bitter comments on this letter in his *History of . . . King Edward the I* (vol. iii of his *Records*) p. 264f. (London, 1670).

[24] Cf. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* etc. (Florentiae [etc.], 1759——), vol. 22, col. 219.

[25] *Reg.*, p. 130f.

[26] *Reg.*, vol. iii, p. xxx and f.

ognized exceptions[27] and also many places which were constantly cases of dispute because their status was uncertain. King Edward claimed absolute control over the royal chapels of Wolverhampton, Stafford and others, and forbade all episcopal or even archiepiscopal interference in these royal chapels. But Peckham included them in his visitation journey in 1280, for he would let the king know that the new primate was no reed shaken by the wind. Arriving at Wolverhampton, he found the doors of the church locked against him[28] so that he could not enter. The archbishop asserted his authority and the king maintained his special exemptions; several letters were exchanged[29] and in the end the prelate had to yield his point.

It was an age of special claims to local privileges. The Chapter of Canterbury claimed that all bishops of that province should be consecrated in that cathedral. There were quarrels about the rights of burial in chapels which were not parish churches, and about the claims of monks and of parishioners to portions of the same church, as at Leominster and Rochester. The University of Oxford claimed the right to adjudicate all cases of immoralities which (in other places) could be tried in the ecclesiastical courts. Officials of all ranks were straining their rights and trying to extend their jurisdiction, often by pleas which seem at times quite fanciful and puerile. The vast number of exemptions and irregularities resulted in conflicting jurisdictions and in a general disorganization of the church's discipline and administration. As Capes says:[30]

> "The ambition of every religious house was to free itself from episcopal control: of the dependent cell to shake off the tutelage of the convent: of the bishop to defy his metropolitan: of the chaplain or servant of the king to escape the bishop's order to reside upon his benefice: of the archbishop to obtain the Papal Bulls which dispensed with restrictions of Canon Law. All these privileges were to be purchased for a price. It needed only a long purse and friendly cardinals and a diplomatic agent."

Chancellors and Treasurers, if they were bishops, bled the State for their sees; the king bled the sees for his empty treasury. Privileges on sale at Rome increased the disorganization of the

---

[27] Cf. G. G. Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion* (Cambridge: University Press, 1923-7), vol. ii, p. 247f.; also appendix 18, where he quotes Peckham as saying (*Reg.*, p. 677) that exemptions help the exempt themselves on the way to damnation, and are perhaps even perilous to the souls of those who grant them.

[28] *Reg.*, p. 131.

[29] *Reg.*, pp. 109, 178-84, and 384f.

[30] *A History of the English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, p. 14.

ecclesiastical machinery. Bishops followed the pope's example and sold licenses, countenanced absenteeism, and instituted mere boys as rectors of important parishes. These conflicts of jurisdiction and these hopes of exemptions made appeals to the pope a constantly increasing practise. Men of every rank were always on their way to Rome with their petitions and grievances. Many indeed were the problems in the church which confronted Peckham, and deeply did he bewail them. In a letter to the Bishop of Tusculum[31] Peckham likens seven of the most deplorable conditions then prevalent in the church to the seven vials mentioned in *Revelation.*

In addition to these problems of general administration, Peckham was further confronted with numerous other problems, many of them bearing upon matters related to religious education. He was faced with the urgent need of raising the standards of the clergy (both regular and secular), of improving conditions within the University of Oxford, and of elevating the moral, religious and intellectual status of the laity generally throughout the province. What he was able to accomplish for religious education along these lines constitutes the main body of the present study.

[31] *Reg.,* pp. 694-7.

PECKHAM'S WORK

I

WITH THE MONASTERIES

Archbishop Peckham sought to purify and elevate the moral atmosphere of the monastic communities in his Province by efforts directed toward three objectives, viz., the promotion of personal morality in individual lives; the improvement of administrative standards where ethical matters were involved; and the promotion of reverence and worship. But many difficulties[1] lay in his path. Some of the important houses had already obtained special papal dispensations exempting them from the duty of submitting to any episcopal oversight or visitations. Even as an invited guest, Peckham could not enter St. Augustine's at Canterbury with his primatial cross erect without a pledge in writing[2] that the form would not imply any authority within the walls of the convent. At Westminster he could not celebrate mass without making a formal explanation that it was being done without detriment to the exemptions of the minster. The abbots of four of the leading monasteries even went so far as to refuse[3] to attend the Council summoned to convene at Lambeth in 1281.

As Coulton says,[4] Peckham's letters are of special value in revealing the prevailing attitude toward penalties for immorality amongst monks and the great difficulties involved in bringing offenders to condign punishment.[5] The Prior of Boxgrove had been convicted of immorality and had been fined £10 by the bishop of Chichester. But Peckham did not think that sins could be commuted by fines; so he took up the case and sought to inflict a more fitting penalty upon the guilty prior. The Primate abhorred the growing system of money-fines for moral offenses, pointed out that such compositions were contrary to canon law, and showed that

---

1 For difficulties connected with visitations, see Coulton, G. G., *Five Centuries of Religion*, vol. ii, pp. 208f., 220, 224, chs. xvii-xxv, appendixes 17, 18, 29, and 30, and *s. v.* Visitation, in index, p. 701-2.

2 Hook states (*op. cit.*, p. 343) that "no power on earth could persuade Friar John to affix his seal to the document", and gives references.

3 W. W. Capes, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

4 *Five Centuries of Religion*, vol. ii, p. 339.

5 Cf. *Reg.*, pp. 553, 374, 682-3 and 811.

they were essentially unjust since it was really the whole community of monks which had to pay the fine in the last analysis, although it was only the prior who had sinned. So Peckham insisted that the prior be deposed.

In his efforts to promote personal morality, Peckham singled out what he considered to be the five outstanding sins oftenest found in a convent, viz., sins of the flesh, theft, proprietorship, conspiracy against prelates and plots against a fellow monk.[6] These sins he regarded as peculiarly characteristic of monastic life,[7] and he sought to extirpate them wherever they were growing.[8] Absolution from these five sins was to be had only from the prior[9] or from the abbot and one specially appointed confessor.[10]

To these five should be added "worldliness", which Peckham combatted with great vigor. To the Prior of Cokesford he wrote in no uncertain tone of rebuke, stating that the countryside was being scandalized by the Prior's conduct and worldliness: "canes sequi diceris plusquam libros".[11] The Archbishop instructed the Official of the Archdeacon of Lewes to investigate the charges against the Prior of Hastings. Worldliness was prominent among these indictments: "Quod prior solus cum solo garcione per totam patriam vagatur et discurrit".[12] In a scathing letter sent to the Abbot of Clugny regarding the conditions at the Priory of Lewes,[13] the Primate laments that although he is now an old man[14] he has never once seen a person spiritually fit for the care of souls appointed as prior at Lewes: all have been robbers rather than pastors.

So concerned is Peckham about the insidious effects of worldliness that he writes to the Prior of Ewenny,[15] requiring him to examine his entire household three times a year as to their probity (*honestate*); and to the Prioress of the Holy Sepulchre, Canterbury, he sends injunctions that a stop must be put to the squabblings, altercations, and verbal tilts among the nuns, for such asperities

---

6 *Reg.* p. 260.

7 Cf. "quinque quae maculant nonnullos de religionis frustra nomine gloriantes" —*loc. cit.* The list is given on p. 345 also.

8 E. g., at Glastonbury Abbey, *loc. cit.;* at Llanthony Priory, *Reg.* p. 800; at Bardney Abbey, *Reg.,* p. 823; &c.

9 *Reg.,* p. 802.

10 *Reg.,* p. 825.

11 *Reg.,* p. 163.

12 *Reg.,* p. 609.

13 *Reg.,* pp. 902-5.

14 Cf. *Reg.,* p. 903; "Jam attigimus tempora senectutis."

15 *Reg.,* pp. 798-800.

soil and deform the "honestatis monasticae splendorem".[16] If any nun continue to be insolent and abusive, she is to be put in a dark room under the dormitory, which no one for any cause whatsoever is to presume to enter.

Of the five peculiarly characteristic sins of inmates of monastic houses, Peckham devoted much time to combatting the sins of the flesh. His condemnations of lubricity may be seen in his ordinances for Christchurch, Canterbury,[17] and in his injunctions for the priory of Mottesfont,[18] and need not be described here. He felt that some hope lay in the direction of keeping women, even women on business or errands, away from the limits of the monasteries[19] and even of the manors. His orders to Mottesfont convent included even the *mulieres coagulatrices*.[20]

These dairy-maids were necessary workers in any large monastic house possessing a number of cattle.[21] There were also monastic granges "to which from time to time the religious went for a change of scene and life";[22] and from the precincts of these farms women were to be rigidly excluded according to Peckham's order and men were to be put in their places. If enough men could not be found to do the work, elderly women might be employed, provided they had passed their sixtieth birthday.[23]

Among the methods employed by Peckham in his efforts to promote personal morality was the curious process known as "purgation".[24] At that period each bishop was allowed to send at stated times to demand that clerics arrested by the secular authorities should be released from jail and handed over to the bishop. The first Statute of Westminster (1275) provided that clerks guilty of felony, and handed over to the Ordinary on his demand, should not be released without sufficient evidence of witnesses in their favor (*sans due purgation*).[25] If they pleaded innocent and could

---

16 *Reg.*, p. 706.

17 *Reg.*, pp. 341-5.

18 *Reg.*, pp. 645-9.

19 Cf. *Reg.*, p. 707.

20 Dairy-maids. (Prof. A. G. Little—in some personal correspondence with the present writer.)

21 See Gasquet, *English Monastic Life* (London, 1904), pp. 161-7.

22 Gasquet, *op. cit.*, p. 146. Some monastic houses in England possessed as many as twenty-two such farms. See Capes, *op. cit.*, pp. 62, 135, and 290. For continental conditions, see Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion,* vol. ii, ch. iii, and Appendix 6.

23 For some details regarding dairy-maids in monasteries, see Coulton, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 652. Cf. also *Reg.*, p. 164.

24 Capes, *op. cit.*, p. 234.

25 *Ibid.*, p. 5.

assemble a required number of friends who would say that they believed the clerks to be innocent, and if no conclusive counter-evidence were brought against them, they were acquitted or "purged". On this point there were often grave misgivings that criminous clerks were being let loose upon the community.[26] So large was the number of clergy drawn from the lowest class of society that many dangerous criminals were found among their number, often desperate ruffians profiting by the protection which "benefit of the clergy" gave them.[27]

A few further details are given by Lee, who says[28] that canonical purgation was performed before a bishop or his deputy and twelve clerics, before whom the person accused took an oath of his innocence, and then the twelve clerks took an oath that they believed that the man had sworn to the truth. To modern ears this procedure may sound crude, absurd, or immoral. It is very difficult, if not impossible, at this distance of time to estimate with accuracy the algebraic sum of the values, positive and negative, which accrued to religious education from this practice; but Peckham lent his support to this method of ascertaining guilt.[29] He rebuked the Bishop of Norwich for the unreasonable demands which he was laying upon compurgators, e. g., requiring them to travel twenty or thirty miles for the trial and repelling any who might appear in poor clothes, as though "purgationi sit vestis necessaria nuptialis".[30] The Primate was not unaware that the procedure might sometimes be nothing but a farce.[31]

Archbishop Peckham made very serious efforts to raise administrative standards in the monasteries. He sought to improve the ethical tone with which many of the monasteries were being conducted and to place their management upon a higher level than that which prevailed in many places. These efforts, although often of a somewhat impersonal nature, were sure to have a reflex upon the atmosphere of the particular monastery to which they were directed, and hence they possess significance, not only for the execu-

---

26 *Ibid., loc. cit.*

27 *Ibid.*, p. 235. Cf. also pp. 252 and 259.

28 *A Glossary of Liturgical and Ecclesiastical Terms* (London, 1877), p. 303. Cf. also Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion,* vol. ii, pp. 285f and 490f.

29 *Reg.*, p. 613f. Cf. pp. 780f, 919, and 1048 (f. 133, ij.). P. 780 states the charges (inciting to rebellion, bearing arms against the realm, and homicide) in a particular case, and refers to the canonical number (12) of men *sui status et ordinis.*

30 *Reg.*, p. 178.

31 Cf. *Reg.*, p. 364: "purgationem sibi judici circumveniendo;" and "sub confictae purgationis umbraculo." Cf. Coulton, *Medieval Studies*: Second Series (London, 1907—), No. 8, p. 14f.

tive aspects of monastic life, but also for the religious education which the members of that monastery received.

The ethical conceptions of monks with regard to honesty in business transacitons would inevitably be affected by the standard accepted by those administrating the funds of the monastery. Laxity in financial matters was certain to have an influence in determining the attitude of younger monks towards transactions involving money or property. If the prior were careless or dishonest in the discharge of his administrative duties, his delinquencies could not but lower the ethical ideals of his inferiors. Any thing which would raise and improve the prior's own conceptions of business probity would, therefore, have significance for the religious education which was being subtly provided by the atmosphere which the prior himself was partly instrumental in creating.

The Archbishop realized these far-reaching effects of laxity in the management of a monastery and he sought in many ways to correct and elevate the prevailing standards. Peckham suspected that the prior at Rochester, and possibly some of the other monks there, had misappropriated some of the monastic funds and were concealing them. So he wrote an urgent letter[32] to the Bishop of Rochester, asking him to make a thorough investigation into the matter and to report to him his findings. In his long letter to the Prior of Mottesfont[33] he demands that the prior render a full account of his work during the past three years as exterior cellarer in the presence of the subprior and the senior monks, and he prescribed certain changes in the administration of the monastery which would tend to clear the atmosphere and render it unnecessary for the prior to soil his hands by touching money. At Southwark Priory Peckham removed the cellarer and also the chamberlain[34] and insisted that one monk should not hold two offices at the same time. Reading Abbey had run into greater debt than hard times alone could justify, and the Archbishop lays it to "defectu regiminis".[35] He promptly prescribes greater economy in the management and demands the appointment of a committee of three (two monks and the abbot's chaplain) to act as a board of trustees among whose duties would be the rendering of an account two or three times a year of all receipts and expenses in scrupulous fashion.[36] To prevent misappropriation of monastic funds and to keep

---

[32] *Reg.*, p. 621f.
[33] *Reg.*, pp. 645-9.
[34] *Reg.*, p. 718f.
[35] *Reg.*, p. 223f.
[36] *Reg.*, p. 225.

their administration upon a high ethical level, Peckham insisted upon systematic accounting of all funds[37] also at Glastonbury Abbey,[38] Christchurch, Canterbury,[39] St. Martin's, Dover,[40] St. Mary's, Southwark,[41] the Augustine Priory at Haverford West,[42] in all the convents in the diocese of St. David's,[43] at Ewenny Priory,[44] at Bardney Abbey,[45] and at Godstow Abbey.[46]

Extravagance and display in monasteries would be sure to give the monks an incorrect conception of the true nature of the religious life, and so Peckham set his face sternly against them wherever they existed. He wished monks and nuns to realize that the cloistered life was one of self-denial and simplicity, and so he undertook to create an atmosphere in convents which would be conducive to the inculcation of this truth. At Wherwell Abbey he prohibited their sumptuous banquets (*lauta convivia*)[47] and also at Romsey Abbey (*tua splendide convivante*)[48] where the abbesses were living in extravagance and display. At the latter place, Peckham discovered that the abbess was causing great scandal by the number of her apes and dogs and personal maids; so he wrote to her: "Non sit ibi simia, non canum numerositas, nec ultra duas ancillas teneas saeculares."[49]

To the Abbot of Bardney, Peckham wrote a letter[50] urging greater simplicity of life and mentioning in particular the worldly ways of the cellarer, who was forbidden to continue his custom of having *convivia* when he went out to the manors and was directed to return to the abbey to eat whenever it was possible to do so. The Archbishop also told him to be content with just one mounted attendant (*uno tantum comite equite saeculari vel monacho sit contentus*).[51]

---

37 Cf. his phrase *de receptis et expensis . . . reddere rationem* on page 850.

38 *Reg.*, pp. 259-65.

39 *Reg.*, pp. 397-403. .

40 *Reg.*, p. 612f.

41 *Reg.*, p. 717f.

42 *Reg.*, p. 782f.

43 *Reg.*, p. 796. Cf. also p. 800f.

44 *Reg.* pp. 798-800.

45 *Reg.*, pp. 823-6.

46 *Reg.*, p. 850. It seems probable that Peckham was merely enforcing current legislation. Cf. *Constitutiones domini Othoboni,* Canon L: "De ratione administrationis reddenda" in Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 17.

47 *Reg.*, p. 651.

48 *Reg.*, p. 659f.

49 *Reg.*, p. 660. Cf. also p. 662f.

50 *Reg.*, pp. 823-6. Cf. a similar injunction at Eynsham Abbey, p. 845.

51 *Reg.*, p. 824.

The Primate's zeal for greater simplicity and for plainer living in the monasteries extended to many small details. At Enysham Abbey it appears that the Bishop of Lincoln had granted a special indulgence to Frater John when he was the Abbot. This indulgence consisted in the right to have four loaves of bread and four flagons of wine every day for his own personal use. Peckham now modifies this privilege, "quod prius pro seipso solo non sine superfluitate percipere consuevit", so as to make the rations do for both the quondam abbot and his monastic attendant (*commonacho socio*).[52] At Godstow Abbey, the archbishop forbade the nuns addressing each other as *domina,* "sicut nec monachi possunt sine ridiculo domini appellari".[53] But "the custom had begun centuries before, and was destined to outlive him by even longer years".[54] One wonders also how effective his prohibition of a brown habit and of plaited under-garments (*rugatas tunicas*) may have proved among these same nuns. At least it is clear that the archbishop stood firmly for the simplicity of life which ought to characterize all members of monastic households.

Peckham himself has given us an insight into his own soul with regard to this matter of simplicity and poverty. After a meditation upon the Infancy of the Holy Child,[55] expressed in words of great tenderness, Peckham declares that such a meditation makes one wish to renounce the world and long to embrace the vow of poverty.

> "Moved by this, for poverty then the soul doth thirst,
> Chooses poor and scanty food, raiment of the worst;
> Toil is into pleasure turned, values are reversed,
> And the glory of the world is a bubble burst."[56]

The Archbishop taught this respect for simplicity by example, as well as by precept. When he visited his beloved priory of Lewes, after honoring it by celebrating a pontifical mass in great pomp and splendor, he displayed his own personal humility by eating with the humble monks in the common refectory and not in the prior's private quarters.[57]

---

52 *Reg.,* p. 843.

53 *Reg.,* p. 849.

54 Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion* vol. ii, p. 51.

55 *Philomena,* lines 100-128.

56 *Ibid.,* lines 129-132—Dobell's translation. The truly Franciscan quality of this sentiment can be even more clearly seen by a perusal of the poem in its entirety.

57 See "Annales conscripti a monacho quodam de Lewes a Christo nato ad annum 1312", being Cotton MS. Tiberius A. x., under the year 1282. This MS. has been printed and translated in the *Sussex Archeological Collections,* vol. ii. (London, 1849). The passage occurs on pp. 33 and 34.

A rigid classification of Peckham's efforts to improve monastic life into efforts with individuals and efforts with the systems of administration is not entirely possible. There are cases of overlapping, where classification must depend upon which aspect receives the greater emphasis, e. g., the Primate's requirement that the nuns at Barking,[58] Godstow,[59] Wherwell,[60] and Romsey[61] should make their confessions in a place sufficiently public to prevent even the suspicion of scandal. Confession played a most important role in the religious education of that time, as it does still among all Roman Catholics, and Peckham's concern that confessions should be made where they would be free from any suggestion of scandal could not but serve to elevate the position which the confessional held in the minds of the people, both within and without the convents.

In his attempts to elevate the administrative standards of some of the monasteries, Peckham did not hesitate to correct abuses in even very minor matters, e. g., indulgence in matters of food, recreation, &c. At Glastonbury Abbey he noted that the monks were allowed to have refreshments between meals. This laxity he condemned and ordered the refectory door to be kept closed after those who ate at the second table had finished their meal.[62] Dogs and birds he regarded as out of place in a monastery and he forbade any one at Christchurch, Canterbury, to waste his time on "canum et avium vanitatem".[63] At Cokesford he prohibited chess-playing and other similarly disgraceful pastimes in no uncertain language: "Scaccorum autem ludum et consimilia scurrilia solatia vobis omnibus . . . perpetue inhibemus", threatening any future indulgence with a double penalty—deprivation of the privilege of entering a church and a three days' fast on bread and water.[64]

Francis Aidan Gasquet refers[65] to this passage as follows:—

"Archbishop Peckham was apparently somewhat shocked to find that the prior of Cokesford, in Norfolk, at times indulged in a

---

58 *Reg.*, p. 85: "in loco publico et omnibus exposito."

59 *Reg.*, p. 849: in loco . . . publico coram altari exposito."

60 *Reg.*, p. 653: "non in diverticulo aliquo vel loco abscondito, sed patulo et omnibus exposito, ubi liber sit omnium transitus et aspectus."

61 *Reg.*, p. 664: "in ecclesia vel ante majus altare, vel in ejusdem latere versus claustrum."

62 *Reg.*, p. 261: "Post prandium insuper illorum qui in secunda mensa comedunt, claudatur ostium refectorii, et ab illa hora privatae potationes usque ab communem coenam vel collationem omnium excludantur."

63 *Reg.*, p. 343.

64 *Reg.*, p. 165.

65 *English Monastic Life*, (London, 1904), p. 146. The Reverend Father Frank M. Marchant, S. T. D., of Buffalo, New York, who spent many years in Europe as

game of chess with some of his canons. In other houses he found that dogs were kept and even stranger pets like apes, cranes, and falcons were retained in captivity by the religious. It is difficult to draw the exact line by passing which monastic gravity is supposed to be injured, and so there was, no doubt, constant need for regulation on all these matters. But some such amusements were necessary, and by them, the tension of long-continued conventual exercises was relieved".

The Primate realized that a man who was unable to speak English could have but little influence in any clerical position, and he set his foot down firmly against the custom of sending Italian and French clerics into England if they were unable to speak English. This was a distinct gain so far as the religious education of those placed under the clerics was concerned. For the priory at Lewes, Peckham was particularly anxious to have a man appointed who could speak English and he wrote to the Abbot of Clugny to that effect.[66]

If an abbot or a prior abused his power or misused the prerogatives of his office, he ceased to be a model for his inferiors and became a dangerous influence in his community. Peckham realized the insidious influence for evil which such a man would exert, discrediting the cause of real religion and by his example obstructing the cause of religious education within the sphere of his influence. The archbishop therefore did all that was in his power to check abuse of power on the part of abbots and priors.

At Southwick, the primate found the ex-prior availing himself of his position in ways which Peckham would not tolerate. The indulgent monk was retaining the special room which had been his while he was prior, with its door opening into the garden, and was refusing to live the life of the rest of the household. Peckham therefore deprived him of his private room and ordered the door into the garden to be blocked up. He also demanded that the monk should henceforth eat in the refectory and sleep in the dormitory "sicut alius canonicus".[67]

To curb the tendency of priors and abbots to magnify their office at the expense of the other brethren and to transact impor-

---

a Dominican monk, has told the writer that even to the present day many religious houses on the Continent maintain large, out-of-doors aviaries filled with every species of non-predatory bird which is able to survive in that latitude. On convent pets, see E. Power, *Medieval English Nunneries* (Cambridge: University Press, 1922), pp. 306f, and 588-95.

66 *Reg.*, p. 904. Cf. also p. 351.

67 *Reg.*, pp. 666-8. Cf. his somewhat similar measures at Eynsham Abbey (p. 843) and Luffield (p. 854).

tant business without consulting any one, Peckham insisted upon the appointment of an advisory council of the senior members and made it obligatory upon the prior or abbot to consult this body before undertaking any important business. He restrained the arbitrary and autocratic attitude of these administrators by insisting that "quod omnes tangit, debet ab omnibus approbari,"[68] and he gave definite orders requiring the appointment of an advisory council at Christchurch, Canterbury,[69] at Rochester,[70] at Wherwell Abbey,[71] at Romsey Abbey,[72] and elsewhere.[73]

Peckham realized that the complete effectiveness of the religious life was quite impossible where the energies of the monks were dissipated by various worldly occupations. The life itself, the round of duties prescribed by the *regula,* was the pedagogue of those who sought to lead the *regular* life, and whatever weakened the close observance of the spirit of the *regula,* weakened also the effectiveness of the religious training which the *regula* was able to give. So Peckham reiterated the prohibition against owning *res vel pecuniam* or even having any in their custody;[74] he repeated the exhortation to alms-giving;[75] he forbade shortening the period of probation, at least in one case;[76] and he took measures to keep all monks within the precincts of their convents, both by forbidding their appointment as farm-superintendents (*maneriorum custodii*)[77] and by condemning *gyrovagatio*[78] and hunting parties which wandered all over the country-side with dogs and birds.[79]

In these and in other ways[80] Peckham sought to sharpen or at least to quicken the sense of responsibility in all those who were undertaking the religious life. He was keenly alive to the temptations which came to monks to break the spirit as well as the letter of the *regula* under which they lived, and he particularly sought to keep them from soiling their hands with money or property or even

---

68 *Reg.,* p. 648.

69 *Reg.,* pp. 397-403.

70 *Reg.,* pp. 622-5.

71 *Reg.,* p. 652: "ad minus duodecim."

72 *Reg.,* p. 659: "juxta regulam cum duodecim ad minus senioribus dominabus."

73 Cf. Glastonbury, *Reg.,* p. 262.

74 *Reg.,* p. 342.

75 *Reg.,* p. 261: "Eleemosynam insuper cum omni diligentia servari jubemus."

76 At Wherwell Abbey.

77 *Reg.,* p. 89. Cf. pp. 399f and 546.

78 *Reg.,* pp. 162 and 609.

79 *Reg.,* pp. 225 and 343.

80 E. g., his insistence that the prior should be diligent in his attentions to the sick and infirm in his monastery. Cf. *Reg.,* p. 648: "Prior . . . visitet infirmos assidue, et omni misericordia provideat necessitatibus singulorum."

from acting as executors of wills.[81] He emphatically states[82] that the purity of the religious life is to be kept clean from any stain of worldliness all the more assiduously because the innocence and ingenuousness of holy devotion is so easily injured whenever the mind's eye, distracted from devotion to its single goal, is ensnared by outside cares.

Of more direct bearing upon religious education in its restricted sense were Peckham's efforts to increase the spirit of reverence in all monastics and to promote the worship of God through greater attention to the various services in the monastery chapel and through a more devout participation in them. Whatever is at any time included in a form of service to be used by a group of people is certain to possess some measure of educational value. Any change in such a set form of service is likewise certain to involve implications for the religious education of that particular group. Peckham found himself involved in a movement to shorten some of the monastic services.

By this time so many accretions had become incorporated into the services that the English Benedictines had attempted to shorten their services. At the General Chapter held in 1277, it had been stated that the length of the office was engendering dislike and extinguishing devotion, and that the duty of learning such long services by heart was hindering many from entering the Order.[83] It was there agreed that certain changes should be made to shorten the services. But Archbishop Peckham and the bishops assembled in convocation forbade the use of this mutilated office,[84] *i. e.,* the omission of the Athanasian Creed, of the Vespers and Lauds of All Saints, &c.[85]

Among Peckham's efforts to promote greater reverence in the worship of God must be included his prohibition of superstitious customs connected with Christmas and Ascension Day[86] at Romsey Abbey, which Martin[87] has described as follows:—

> "The ordinary superstitions observed throughout England on Ascension Day were a processional perambulation of the parish 'to obtain God's blessing upon the fruits of the ground' . . .

---

81 Lambeth Constitution: "Ne religiosi executores testimentorum fiant", Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 59.

82 *Loc. cit.*

83 Rose Graham, *English Ecclesiastical Studies* (London, 1929), p. 339.

84 *Reg.,* pp. 150, 225 and 259. In connection with the case at Ramsay, W. A. Pantin gives a reference to Cambridge University Library MS. Hh, VI, II, fol. 1. See *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* Fourth Series, vol. x (1927), pp. 210-1. Cf. also *Reg.,* p. 82.

85 For a fuller treatment of this matter, see *Reg.,* vol. ii, pp. lxviii-lxxii.

86 *Reg.,* p. 664.

and to impress the boundary line on the memory of the future generations by whipping boys or bumping casual strangers at the boundary stones. . . . It is not likely however that the nuns of Romsey joined in this amusement, but rather that they allowed the procession to pass through their precincts and bless their crops and orchards, with the time honored verse

'Stand fast root; bear well top;
God send us a youling sop.
Every twig, apple big,
Every bough, apple enow.'

Another observance peculiar to the time was to hang up an egg laid on that day as a talisman.

"But the stern friar forbade all such religious diversions, both then and on Christmas Day. The prohibited ceremony on the latter festival was doubtless the preparation of a kind of puppet show of the birth of Christ."

Peckham also sought to reduce to a minimum the festivities, often of a most hilarious nature, connected with the "Boy Bishop ceremonies"[88] associated with the Feast of the Holy Innocents. At Barking Nunnery he grudgingly[89] permitted them to continue, but he restricted them as to the length of time during which they would be countenanced—they were not to begin until the completion of vespers on the Feast of Blessed John the Evangelist.[90] He objected to the way the nuns absented themselves from vespers, to the men and women present in the choir, to some of the nuns taking part in the ceremonies when little children were lacking, and to the tendency to turn divine worship into a farce.[91] He then proceeds to take up several other matters relating to the convent priests, sacristans, place where the sacrament is reserved, etc., and enjoins greater reverence in all these matters, adding: "Statuimus etiam ut silentium locis et temporibus statutis regulariter observetur."

The sacrament of the eucharist played a most important part in the religious life of all monks and nuns at that time as it does today. Its reception was prepared for with care, self-examination, contrition, confession, reparation and fasting. It was one of the

---

87 *Reg.*, vol. ii, pp. lxxiii-lxxiv.

88 *Ibid.*, pp. lxxiv-lxxvii. See also fuller descriptions given in Leach, *Schools of Medieval England* (London, [1915]), pp. 144-55. Cf. Gasquet, *Parish Life in Medieval England* (2nd. ed., London, 1907), p. 167f.; and Coulton, *Medieval Studies*, No. 8 (Second Series), Appendix, pp. 5 and 13f. Also Power, *op. cit.*, pp. 311-4.

89 *Reg.*, p. 82: "non approbamus, sed cum displicentia sustinemus."

90 I. e., December 27. Holy Innocents falls on December 28. Cf. his similar order to Godstow Abbey (*Reg.*, p. 846): "Puerilia solemnia quae in festo solent fieri Innocentum, post vesperas Sancti Johannis tantum inchoari permittimus, et in crastino in ipsa die Innocentum totaliter terminentur."

91 "Vertatur in ludibrium laus divina."

chief elements in the religious training of all catholics and whatever attitude Peckham assumed toward it would have its implications for religious education. The great veneration and awe with which he regarded this sacrament is clearly seen in his canon *De custodia eucharistiae*[92] passed at the Council of Lambeth and on a lesser scale in his injunctions to Barking Nunnery in which he exhorts the nuns to receive the holy eucharist on all principal feasts and on the anniversaries of their profession unless hindered by some urgent cause or excused by special permission from the abbess.[93]

Attendance at services was regarded by the primate as of paramount importance and indubitably constituted one of the most important elements in the religious education of that period, especially in the monasteries. Even an abbess was not exempt from attending the monastic offices or at least reciting them, if hindered from actual attendance. If the abbess has not found opportunity to attend Compline, Peckham prescribes[94] the exact procedure to be taken: when the office has been finished in the conventual chapel, the nun who has presided over the choir taking with her two of the more distinguished women shall announce to the abbess that Compline has been said. Immediately all drinking in her room shall cease and all seculars shall go out, whether servants or guests, even if they have been religious, and the abbess shall at once say Compline.

This same set of injunctions[95] contains an interesting prohibition, which indicates clearly the respect with which Peckham wished churches to be regarded. The secular and even commercial uses to which parish churches were put at that time were numerous and to modern taste irreverent,[96] but it is of peculiar interest to discover that merchants tried to use even the chapel connected with a nunnery as a place in which to display their wares and make their sales. The motive of the prohibition is revealed in the opening words: "Ob Dei reverentiam et ecclesiae honestatem perpetuo inhibemus ne mercatores sedere in ecclesia cum suis mercibus permittantur".

---

92 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 52.

93 *Reg.,* p. 83.

94 *Reg.,* p. 651. Cf. also his orders (*Reg.,* p. 794) that the canons of St. David's were to be penalized for absence from services.

95 *Reg.,* pp. 650-4.

96 Capes, *op. cit.,* p. 270f. See also Constitution XXXIV of Ottobon in Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 14

II.

WITH THE SECULAR CLERGY

Peckham undertook to elevate the standards prevailing among the secular clergy also. He made great effort to promote their personal life, religious and moral, he sought to raise the general standards of the whole profession, and he was indefatigable in his efforts to increase their reverence and ideal of worship.

Much valuable information regarding the secular clergy has been extracted by Capes from primary sources of high credibility. He asserts[1] that they were recruited from all classes of society and often possessed very little training. Before ordination some kind of an examination was, theoretically, required;[2] but it was of linguistic[3] rather than theological character, and references to it are so few that one is led to infer that it had become a mere formality. In an age when men from the lowest levels of society[4] could procure Holy Orders, Peckham was naturally and inevitably brought face to face with many problems and difficulties. Various were the forms of delinquencies characteristic of the secular clergy, and various indeed were the methods frequently adopted by bishops in their efforts to correct these short-comings. Capes says[5]:

> "If a rector was backward in paying his Peter's pence, or his procurations for the cardinals who came on the pope's behalf, or his farthing in the pound for a professorship at Oxford, when required; if he absented himself without license, and left his sheep without a shepherd; if he had failed as executor to clear his accounts, the mandate was issued, and his barns were locked up till payment was received. . . . The sanctions varied with the gravity of the offences, but in the last resort there was always the sentence of excommunication, with the possible appeal to the civil arm to enforce the bishop's censures."

Peckham's own efforts to ameliorate prevailing conditions among the secular clergy assumed various forms and often defy any rigid form of classification. Two prominent vices he seemed to

---

1 Capes, *op. cit.*, pp. 229-30 and Chapter XIII. Cf. also Gasquet, *Parish Life*, p. 77.

2 See Leach, *Schools of Medieval England*, p. 160 for mention of the examination prior to ordination required in London, c. 1250; and cf. Wykeham's *Reg.* (A. D. 1379), vol. i, p. 294: "illos . . . examinatos idoneosque repertos" and "omnes subscripti fuerunt examinati", regarding candidates for ordination. See also Gasquet, *op. cit.*, pp. 78-83.

3 Cf. Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. ii, p. 150: "examinatione . . . literatura."

4 Cf. Gasquet, *Parish Life*, p. 72f.

5 *Op. cit.*, p. 235f.

single out for particular correction, incontinence and avarice. The first is here treated under the head of efforts to promote personal morality, but the second is included under his attempts to elevate the standards of the profession. The reason for this distinction is to be found in the point of view from which the whole subject is here approached, *viz.*, religious education. There is nothing to indicate that Peckham combatted the avarice of the clergy because he feared its influence upon their own characters or because he dreaded its effect upon their own personal morality. On the other hand, he seemed to object to greed and extortion largely because they wrought injury to the church and brought the whole ecclesiastical system into disrepute and thus derogated from its effectiveness as an instrument for religious education.

Partly because this seems to have been his real motive, and partly because his prohibition of all kinds of extortion seems a counterpart of his injunctions directing a more generous distribution of alms, his efforts to combat avarice are not included under his efforts to promote personal morality. These latter seem to have centered around his horror of the sin of incontinence[6] wherever it existed. To the Bishop of St. Asaph's he wrote:

> "The vice of incontinence on the part of your clergy has been widely known for a long time to besmirch them to an enormous extent and quite beyond all bounds of toleration (*enormiter ultra modum*), which is a perfectly plain proof of negligence on the part of their prelates, we emphatically command you by virtue of the oath of obedience which you have taken (recalling clearly to your mind the canonical statutes which we know you have sworn to support) that you, in the future, shall punish beneficed clerics who are incontinent, according to the very sacred statutes of the lords Otho[7] and Othobon[8], legates of the Apostolic See."[9]

The earnestness with which Peckham attacked this grave evil[10] can be seen in the severity of the penalties which he assigned to violators of the vows involved in clerical celibacy even when they

---

[6] Cf. his decree, "De concubinariis puniendis", promulgated at Reading, with the injunction that it be read four times a year at the principal chapter-meetings of the rural deanery by the archdeacons or the rural deans or their representatives distinctly and openly before the whole chapter, the laity being excluded. Any one maliciously hindering the reading of this statute is to be excommunicated, and any official who neglects to read it must be made to fast six days on bread and water. See Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 36. For comments on this decree, see Cutts, *Parish Priests and their People,* p. 266f.

[7] Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. i, p. 647-56.

[8] *Ibid.,* vol. ii, p. 5.

[9] *Reg.,* p. 738.

[10] For an extended treatment of this subject, see Cutts, *op. cit.,* Chapter xvii: The Celibacy of the Clergy; especially pp. 267-8, and 275.

were rectors of churches. The rector of Hamme, convicted of incontinence and fornication with several women, he suspended from the rectorship for three years and enjoined upon him a pilgrimage to St. James of Compostella, to Rome and to Colonia. Peckham then appointed Ralph, rector of the church at Barrow (Barewe), as acting rector of the vacant church on a salary of one hundred pounds sterling per year.[11] Peckham's motives in this action were mixed—he desired to promote both the welfare and safety of the rector himself and also the well-being and salvation of those under him in the parish.[12]

Oliver, son of Ernisius, rector of the church of Eltisley, was reported to have had a concubine for over a year, and although he had now abandoned her[13] Peckham wrote an urgent letter to the Bishop of Ely requiring him to take the steps prescribed by the statutes of Otho and Ottobon in such cases and to proceed to the deprivation from orders of the incontinent rector. The primate urges the bishop to inflict such a punishment that it will be a warning to others (*horrorem incutiat*) and will edify those who have been scandalized by the rector's filth (*spurcitia*).

A peculiarly revolting crime[14] had been committed by the rector of St. Ebbes, Oxford, "in scandalum totius parochiae et non exilis numeri aliorum". Peckham wrote a letter[15] to the Archdeacon of Oxford directing him to make a careful investigation into the whole matter and report to him the amount of the truth that there was to the report. The Register does not allude to the case again; but if Peckham later learned that the rector was guilty, it is probable that the Primate meted out a punishment similar to those indicated in the preceding cases.

Quite regardless of the merits of the method known as "purgation", it is of interest to note that Peckham employed it, or at least urged its employment in the case of a rector, Simon de Stanbrigge, who had abducted the wife of a certain soldier, Sir Richard Caldwell, in a letter to the Dean and a Canon of Chichester.[16] He

---

[11] *Reg.*, p. 585f.

[12] "ipsius rectoris propriae et sibi subjectorum animarum saluti prospicere cupientes."

[13] *Reg.*, p. 829f. gives the sordid details.

[14] "filiam suam spiritualem, uxorem scilicet cujusdam parochiani sui dicti Willelmi le Boltere, continuato corrumpens incestu et adulterio"—*Reg.*, p. 856.

[15] *Reg.*, pp. 855-7.

[16] *Reg.*, p. 613f. It was a case of incest only in the sense that the woman was his *filia spiritualis*. In the eyes of the church, however, that constituted incest. See also *Calendar of the Close Rolls; Edward I* (London, 1900), vol. ii, pp. 163 and 392; and Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion*, vol. ii, p. 250, note 1. For the compurgation system in general, see Coulton, *op. cit.*, p. 285f., and Appendix 27.

directs these two clergymen to hold the rector's purgation before a group of twelve rectors, vicars or other priests of that region who are not bespattered by any crimes of their own.

Peckham's desire to promote higher ethical ideals among the clergy can be seen also in his injunctions to the Bishop of St. David's.[17] The canons of the cathedral had fallen into great laxity, gravely neglecting their work and the church services. Throughout the diocese there had grown up among the clergy a convenient but disgraceful scheme of compounding for their sins annually by a payment of money in such a way that "eis quasi videatur vendi licentia delinquendi".[18] Peckham demanded that this immoral procedure be stopped. His desire to elevate the standards of personal morality among the clergy was too great to allow him to countenance anything savoring of a license to sin, even when it was sanctioned by another bishop. This prohibition occurs in such close connection with the reference to incontinence ("In clericis igitur puniendis pro lubricitatis vitio") that one surmises that most of the sins compounded for were sins of the flesh, especially as the injunction goes on to deprive from every ecclesiastical privilege any clerk found guilty of concubinage.

Registers and Chronicles quite frequently describe clergy who were delinquent, non-resident, or contumacious, and seldom make mention of those who were spending their lives in the unobtrusive fulfilment of their appointed duties. But in the very nature of the case, it would be the unfaithful and negligent priests who would receive exhortations and warnings from the Ordinary's pen, while the latter group would receive his praise and appreciation (when given) from him in person at the time of his visitation.[19] So it is quite natural that, except for Chaucer's somewhat later portrait of the ideal parish priest, the fairer side of the priest's pastoral life is seldom presented.

The Archbishop also sought to raise the standards of the clerical profession as a whole. These efforts have a bearing upon religious education in so far as the training of clergy in service is a part of religious education in its broader aspect. Some of the steps

---

17 *Reg.*, pp. 794-7.
18 *Reg.*, p. 795.
19 Cf. Gasquet, *Parish Life*, p. 9 (and p. 84).
20 Cf. "Pluralism was the corrupt practice of accumulating in a single hand, without sufficient dispensation, two or more ecclesiastical benefices involving the cure of souls"—Ogle, Arthur, *Canon Law in Mediaeval England* (London, 1912), p. 119. For a detailed study of the Primate's warfare with Pluralism, see W. T. Waugh's article, "Archbishop Peckham and Pluralities" in *The English Historical Review* vol. xxviii (1913), pp. 625-635. This study is from the point of view of Canon Law and has ample notes giving extended quotations from primary sources.

undertaken by Peckham along these lines possessed an added significance for religious education in as much as they had a direct or indirect reflex upon the laity.

For example, Peckham's long combat against Pluralism[20] and Absenteeism[21] not only affected the clergymen themselves, but had a very real bearing upon the religious education given to the laity during his own episcopate; for clergy who had but one benefice with cure of souls and who remained in residence were more able to discharge their duties as pastors and teachers than clergy who had to divide their time and labor between two or more cures or who were absent from their flock for long periods of time. The fact that the archbishop entered England with special verbal instructions from the Pope himself[22] to stamp out Pluralism has no special importance for religious education except as its effects upon the clergy and thus indirectly upon the laity also are taken into consideration. But when these effects are given their due weight, it is clear that Peckham's long warfare with these two evils, Pluralism and Absenteeism, must have had some very real effect upon religious education, even though the documentary evidence to that effect is limited to the Constitutions of Reading,[23] the Constitutions of Lambeth,[24] and the very large number of letters included in Peckham's official register.[25]

With regard to these letters, there would be no special point in describing each of the separate instances with the amount of detail which would be necessary to render its bearings intelligible to the reader. Each instance had its own background and peculiarities of time, place and personalities; but, taken together, they indicate that very great pressure was brought to bear upon offenders to mend their ways—pluralists were not to be absolved,[26] nor to accept bishoprics,[27] nor to be confirmed as priors,[28] and their extra

---

21 See Cutts, *op. cit.*, p. 330f.

22 See Martin, *Reg., vol.* i, p. lxv, and p. 137.

23 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 33.

24 *Ibid.,* vol. ii, p. 60, "De clericiis plura beneficia occupantibus."

25 *Reg.,* pp. 66, 199, 227, 266, 512f., 540f., 567f., 575f., 583f., 937f., 947f., deal with Pluralism; and pp. 153f., 193f., 479, 715f., 794f., 863f., 954, 1070 (i. e., folio 184 ij) and 1074 (i. e., folio 196 i), and *Diœcesis Cantuariensis* (Canterbury and York Series, part 22) p. 163 deal with Absenteeism. For the exact relation of Peckham's Lambeth decree about pluralism to contemporaneous legatine and papal legislation, see Hamilton Thompson, "Pluralism in the Medieval Church," in *Associated Architectural Societies Reports and Papers,* vol. xxxiii (1915-1916), pp. 35-73; and W. T. Waugh, "Archbishop Peckham and Pluralities", in *English Historical Review,* vol. xxviii (1913), pp. 625-35.

26 *Reg.,* p. 66f.

27 *Reg.,* p. 227f.

28 *Reg.,* p. 575f.

benefices were to be sequestrated.[29] It seems improbable that so much pressure could have been brought to bear without elevating in some degree the general level of the work of the clergy and thus improving in a corresponding degree the quantity (if not also the quality) of the religious education which was provided by the church as a system.

The standards of the clerical profession were inevitably lowered in the eyes of the populace whenever clergymen were found guilty of extortion, and wherever the veneration of the church was lessened, its influence as an agency or instrumentality for religious education was correspondingly weakened. So Peckham wielded the power of his office to stamp out extortion and avarice wherever it existed, even among ecclesiastics as high in rank and dignity as bishops,[30] archdeacons,[31] and deans.[32]

A more constructive method of raising the general standard of the clerical profession was employed by Peckham when he insisted upon a more generous giving of alms on the part of the secular clergy. As Capes says:

> "Systematic alms-giving was . . . looked for. When a license of non-residence was given, the bishop constantly insisted that a part of the income of the benefice should be applied to local charities; a fat portion (*pinguis*) was the rule of Peckham, to be attested by four parishioners of credit. . . . Parochial endowments were of old intended partly for the poor. Thus Peckham orders a neglectful rector of Lyming to give 200 shillings to the poor; another is required to compensate for the lack of his own ministrations by liberalities 'to be left to our discretion.' "[33]

At Hamme, where the rector was sent away on a pilgrimage for three years, Peckham decreed that (after a salary had been paid to the rector and to the acting-rector) the remainder of the income of the church was to be devoted to the uses of the church and to the poor of the parish.[34]

As early as 1281, Peckham had promulgated a decree[35] that all rectors who did not actually reside personally (*qui non faciunt residentiam corporalem*) in their parishes nor provide vicars, should

---

[29] *Reg.*, p. 947f.

[30] *Reg.*, pp. 70, 167 and 177.

[31] *Reg.*, p. 502f.

[32] *Reg.*, p. 740.

[33] *Op. cit.*, p. 264. See Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. ii, p. 58.

[34] *Reg.*, p. 586f. Cf. the case of the rector of Wrotham and Lyming, p. 715f; and also pp. 479, 670f., 739, 895, 949, and 1067 (i. e., folio 177b, iij), a matter of 770 marks.

through their stewards proffer hospitality up to the full extent which the incomes of the church would permit (*juxta quod sufficiunt ecclesiae facultates*), and that aid should be given at the very least to the cases of extreme need amongst the poor of the parish. This reveals quite plainly Peckham's deep concern both for the poor and also for the due and conscientious discharge by the clergy of the duties involved in their sacred office, even when the clergy were prone to claim no responsibility in the matter of providing hospitality, on the ground that they were not at home. In such cases, the primate decreed, the hospitality was to be extended through their stewards (*per œconomos suos*).

Peckham's insistence upon the giving of alms to the poor is seen very clearly in his "Articuli observandi per rectores et vicarios Cantuariensis dioecesis et jurisdictionis".[36]. Two[37] of the eight injunctions are designed to protect the interests of those who might justly be entitled to share in the alms which the rectors and vicars were supposed to have on hand for distribution to needy and deserving individuals. The eighth article seems to reflect the archbishop's desire to sharpen the sense of responsibility for the poor which the clergy were expected to feel, and to insist upon a higher ethical realization of their obligations in the administration of the funds which might come into their hands.[38] That Peckham was very much in earnest with regard to these articles can be seen from the letter[39] to the Archdeacon of Canterbury which accompanied the articles. Peckham states that there are many who boldly plunder the fruits of churches and reap carnal profits where they have never sown spiritual seed but only scandals. He orders the articles to be written out clearly and plainly in the missal or in some other suitable book and to be recited publicly so that they may recur frequently to the minds of the clergy, and be shown to visitors. He threatens excommunication to all who do otherwise or who dare to disregard the articles as written either in whole or in part.[40]

Other instances of Peckham's attempts to cultivate in the clergy a keener sense of responsibility and a higher ethical outlook upon their work are recorded, e. g., his orders to the prior of Wol-

---

35 See Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 57: "De hospitalitate tenenda", being the fourteenth of the Lambeth Constitutions.

36 *Reg.,* p. 949f.

37 "Tertio" and "Octavo."

38 Cf. "decimas . . . quae debent in domo Dei pauperum necessitatibus providere."

39 *Reg.,* 948f.

40 Cf. his threat to the various rectors (which concludes the list of articles) that those who presume to disobey them *graviter puniantur.*

ston[41] and to the rector of Bilsham chapel[42] to see to the repair of their chancels.[43]

It is significant also that at the Council of Lambeth the Archbishop had decreed[44] that all those who were ordained to the minor orders should "be instructed publicly and in the vernacular concerning the distinction of orders, offices and characteristic marks of each and also concerning the progressive increment of the grace which is contained in each of the orders separately and which is increased in the case of those who approach these orders in a worthy fashion".

Another method adopted by Peckham in his efforts to raise the efficiency of the clergy was his policy of enforcing with great strictness all the requirements for the sacred office. By this means he sought to elevate the clerical profession in the eyes of the people, knowing that the prestige of a teacher is an important element in any form of education.

In the pursuit of this policy, the archbishop repeatedly withheld benefices from men who were ineligible because of their illegitimate birth,[45] or because they were under twenty-five years of age,[46] or because they were unordained.[47] The first group would seldom be able to command the respect of the entire community.[48] The exclusion of the second group would tend to produce a more mature ministry by ruling out all those under twenty-five years of age. The third exclusion would limit the ministry to those who had received the canonical promotion to orders, together with whatever training might be involved in such promotion, and would rule out the anomalous situation of a layman presuming to act as a pastor and rector.

Illegitimate birth and servile status were two obstacles which often stood in the way of ordination. Theoretically, either one disqualified a man for ordination, but neither one was an insuperable

---

41 *Reg.,* p. 129f.

42 *Reg.,* p. 360f.

43 All Peckham's efforts to combat Absenteeism, previously cited, would be relevant here too, for they were plainly directed toward sharpening in the clergy a sense of their obligations to the laity. Cf. also *Reg.,* p. 153.

44 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 53.

45 Cf. *Reg.,* p. 556.

46 Martin (in *Reg.,* vol. iii, p. cxxviii) lists this statute as occurring in Bodleian MS. 794, f. 178, Bibl. Bodl. "Constitutiones edite apud Reddygg 'per Johannem de Peccham Cant.' Archiepiscopum, necnon additiones et declarationes ejusdem. . . ."

47 *Reg.,* p. 1073 (i. e., folio 193b, i.). Peckham's letter to the Abbot of Shrewsbury (*Reg.,* p. 482f) alludes to disqualifications but mentions only the absence of the dispensation of the Apostolic See.

48 But see Cutts, *Parish Priests and their People,* pp. 268-278.

barrier. In the case of a man of illegitimate birth seeking orders, the bishop could grant a dispensation for the minor orders and the pope could send a dispensation for the higher orders.[49] In the case of servile status, the local patron would often manumit a villein's son on the day when he was to receive the lowest order, that of acolyte. Whatever may be thought of the merits of the method employed by Peckham, he was but enforcing legislation which had been passed long before his time[50] and which was justified by the belief that whatever was a stain upon the individual would be a stain upon his sacred orders.

Among the methods taken by the primate to raise the standards of the priestly profession was his insistence[51] that the clergy should wear their clerical garb at all times. He points the finger of scorn[52] at those clerics who feel shame to appear as clerks and who hide their tonsure with fillets whenever they show themselves abroad, unless it be when taking a journey and they wish to avail themselves of all the privileges of their sacred order.

In Wales a situation had come to prevail which seemed to Peckham fraught with much danger to the church. The clergy there appear to have given up the distinctive garb of their profession and to have reduced the tonsure to the smallest size possible, hiding it with their long hair, while their striped clothes and bare hands and feet make them look still more like the members of their flocks. So Peckham wrote a lengthy letter[53] to the Bishop of St. Asaph's, "ordinantes ut de cetero clerici vestrae dioecesis in habitu et ornatu, gestu et affatu, ceteris per orbem clericis se conforment".[54] This indicates a desire not only that they wear clerical dress but also that they conform to the kind of garb which was customary elsewhere. That the phrase *per orbem* really meant England is to be seen not only from the whole tenor of the letter,[55]

---

49 Capes, *op. cit.*, p. 230. Actual dispensations granted by Archbishop Winchelsey may be seen in his *Registrum*, pp. 14-16, 25, 78, *et passim*.

50 *The Catholic Encyclopedia, s.v.* Orders, Holy (vol. xi, p. 279f.); and *s.v.* Irregularity — (2) Defect of Birth (vol. viii, p. 170). See also the Constitutions of Otho (1237), Cap. vi: "De scrutino ordinandorum," which excludes idiots, illegitimates, illiterates and others, in Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. i, p. 651; and the contemporaneous statute of Edmund Rich: "De . . . qualitate ordinandorum," in Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, p. 26f; as well as the statutes of Richard, Bishop of Chichester, in Wilkins, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 689; and Coulton, *Medieval Studies*: First Series (2nd revised ed., London, 1915), p. 112f.

51 See Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. ii, p. 59.

52 "Sed proh pudor!" — *loc. cit.*

53 *Reg.*, pp. 737-43.

54 *Reg.*, p. 738.

55 It was largely designed to secure greater conformity with English usages. It implied that Welsh customs were outlandish and must be brought into greater

but also from the phrase *per provinciam* in the succeeding demand that the canons wear capes and amices in the precincts of the cloister and the church, just as the custom is "in ecclesiis aliis cathedralibus per provinciam".[56] Whether these regulations were dutifully obeyed and whether they raised the position and dignity of the church in the eyes of the people to any perceptible degree remain unanswered questions. In this matter, also, Peckham was but enforcing legislation passed many years[57] before his own episcopate commenced.

To the promotion of reverence and devotional worship Peckham dedicated much effort and influence. The center of the worship of all christendom at that time was the Eucharist, and as it was regarded as the chief of the sacraments it occupied a very prominent place in the religious education of the times. There are educational aspects to all forms of worship, and by promoting the reverence to be accorded to the sacrament of the altar, the archbishop was making a distinct contribution to the religious education of that time.

It is indicative of the emphasis which Peckham placed upon this sacrament that the first two canons (after the prefatory section) of the Lambeth Constitutions are entirely devoted to a consideration of various aspects of the Holy Eucharist and especially of the reverence which is to be accorded to it.[58] The first of the canons is titled "De custodia eucharistiae"; and, after lamenting that the priests of the Lord are many in number but few in merit, refers to the scandals which he has been hearing every day about the clergy, and bewails especially that they behave exceedingly irreverently toward the sacrament of the Eucharist, take care of it in a very careless fashion, and leave it unrenewed (literally unchanged, *immutatum*) so long that the element (*species continens*) spoils (*corrumpatur*); thus the Author of Salvation, Who has given Himself to the church with infinite love in the Viaticum is made to suffer the indignity of such wanton irreverence. Thereupon Peckham decreed that in every parish church there shall be

---

conformity with the superior ways prevailing in England. Both Archbishop and King were intent upon anglicizing the Welsh at any cost. Cf. "ut ad unitatis studium cum dominio et populo Anglicano velitis . . . informare" — *Reg.*, p. 741.

[56] *Reg.*, p. 740.

[57] Cf. the Constitutions of Otho (A. D. 1237), xiv: "De habitu clericorum," in Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. i, p. 652; and the Constitutions of Walter Cantilupe (A. D. 1240), "De indumentis clericorum," in Wilkins, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 670.

[58] Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. ii, p. 52. Cf. also Peckham's similar injunction to the diocese of St. Asaph: "prout statutum est in ultimo concilio de Lameth"— *Reg.*, p. 739.

a tabernacle with an appropriate lock, in which the Lord's own Body shall be kept reposing in a very beautiful pyx with linen coverings, and that the Element shall be renewed every Sunday.[59]

Another measure was taken by the Primate to improve the devotional life of his clergy and to increase the number of the services which they conducted. He insisted that the beneficed clergy and those priests who had the cure of souls should celebrate mass with all the chanting and reverence to which the service was entitled.[60] He still further decreed that this service should be held every day (*omni die*[61]) if no canonical impediment stood in the way. It is true that these orders occur in a letter addressed to the Bishop of St. Asaph's and had primary reference only to the clergy in that Welsh diocese. But the daily mass was at that time the law of the church, as Simmons shows,[62] and conditions in England may not have been so lax as those in Wales and hence may not have required any special exhortation from the archbishop. But in more distant Wales, where the exhortation was needed, the primate did not hesitate to give it in words of unmistakable clearness. Any increase in the number of services held or in the reverence with which they were conducted must have had some bearing upon the quality of the religious education furnished by the church, as well as some influence upon the clergy themselves toward a higher and nobler conception of their office and its liturgical duties.

To the clergy of his own diocese Peckham addressed a series of Articles[63] and with them he sent also an emphatic letter[64] to the Archdeacon, making it very plain that he intended to have the Articles observed. The communication to the Archdeacon shows Peckham's concern for the proper discharge of the pastoral office on the part of all the clergy, stating that "nothing in this world is more precious than the cure of souls, since for this alone Christ offered Himself upon the cross".[65]

---

59 Wilkins, *loc. cit.* Cf. also the following canon forbidding priests obligating themselves to say more requiem masses for individuals separately than they are able to say in a year unless they secure outside assistance or celebrate a mass for the dead every day.

60 *Reg.*, p. 739.

61 Cf. also *Reg.*, p. 741.

62 In his preface to *The Lay Folks' Mass Book, E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 118, pp. xxxviii-xxxix. See also Gasquet, *Parish Life, etc.*, p. 141. For the services prescribed by Peckham for Wells Cathedral, see Hist. MSS. Comm.: "Report on the MSS. of Wells Cathedral," p. 71; and the "Calendar of the MSS. of the Dean and Chapter of Wells," p. 149f (and p. 458).

63 *Reg.*, p. 949f.

64 *Reg.*, p. 948f.

65 *Reg., loc. cit.*

The purpose of these Articles was to further the efficiency and to improve the devotion with which the clergy were to discharge their pastoral and executive functions. The first article required the clergy to conduct the services of the church with as much reverence and propriety as they could possibly show, together with assistance from clergy of probity, regularly at all appropriate times.

The second article required the clergy to provide faithfully in spiritual ministrations to the flock committed to their care,[66] namely in the preaching of the Word of God and in the administration of the sacraments of the church, particularly with regard to hearing confessions; and that wherever they themselves were not able to do this they should call to their assistance men of personal holiness specially delegated to do this work. Cotton says[67] that this last requirement refers to the Friars, and this is not improbable, seeing that Peckham himself was a Franciscan and underneath the robes of the archbishop still beat a heart full of sympathy and approval for the lives of self-sacrifice led by the friars whom he knew so well.[68] As was natural, he favored the Franciscans and made many efforts on their behalf.[69]

The third article required the clergy to minister faithfully to the poor and needy and to provide hospitality "prout dictant canonicae sanctiones".

The fourth article[70] forbade the clergy to enter into any contracts with any party who might be able to prejudice the rights of their successors in either temporal or spiritual matters.

The fifth article had reference to keeping up the buildings of the rectory or the vicarage in proper shape.

The sixth required the clergy to try to recover any goods of the church alienated contrary to the *jus commune* and also any liberties lost which were rightly theirs.

The seventh enjoined vigilance in preserving the goods and rights of their churches from alienation or any considerable loss.

The eighth prohibited their selling the produce of their churchlands all at one time and for a lump sum, lest the transaction in-

---

66 *Reg.*, p. 949.

67 *The Grey Friars of Canterbury* (Manchester: University Press, 1924), p. 38.

68 The reason why no special space has been allotted in this study to Peckham's relations with the Friars is because his dealings with them had significance for religious education only in such a manner as to involve their own influence upon the laity, under which heading additional attention is accorded them.

69 See *Reg.*, pp. 99f, 216, 219, 246f, 284, 838f, 946f, 962f.

70 *Reg.*, p. 950.

volve the loss of tithes which ought to go to the relief of the necessities of the poor.

The significance which the first two of these articles possessed for the inculcation of greater reverence and for the advancement of the two chief pastoral functions of the catholic clergy, viz., the preaching of the word of God and the administration of the sacraments, is plain. The Archbishop of Canterbury was lending the weight of his powerful influence to the cause of building up the more efficient discharge of the preaching and sacerdotal duties of the clergy. Bitterly indeed did he lament to the Bishop of Tusculum that when there were elections being held or when there were honors being conferred there was never any allusion to the office of preaching, and that more attention was given to very commonplace glosses than to the words of the gospels themselves.[71]

---

[71] *Reg.*, p. 696.

III

AT OXFORD UNIVERSITY

Peckham's influence extended also to higher education. In 1284 he undertook a rigid visitation of the University of Oxford and ordered several reforms, both in the curriculum and in the administration. His predecessor in the primacy, Robert Kilwardby, had condemned several "errors" in the teaching being given at Oxford and to these errors Peckham now added others. Kilwardby had prohibited the teaching of Aristotle's works on physics and metaphysics; and although this condemnation had been repudiated at the general chapter of Dominicans[1] at Milan and at Paris, Peckham, the Franciscan, did not hesitate to reiterate and renew it in 1284.

But the Dominicans at Oxford had been more loyal to Thomas Aquinas than to Kilwardby, and hence they had accepted most of the philosophical opinions of Aristotle. Peckham, however, was a militant Platonist and appealed to Augustine as the ultimate authority, using all his strength to oppose the advance of the Aristotelian flood.[2] The Oxford Dominicans became resentful of the interference by the Archbishop and keenly antagonistic to him and his Order.

"The struggle was henceforth between the two Orders, who were not only divided profoundly on the question of poverty, but thought so differently on philosophical doctrines of greater moment that one considered as a pernicious error and fatal to the safety of the Church, what the other considered as an ingrained truth on which the faith could without injury rest. . . . The philosophic question on the nature of the soul and on the unity of form having become a new apple of discord between the two orders, one understands how the Church intervened to settle the matter"[3] finally and officially in the person of John XXII in his papal condemnation of the doctrine of the absolute poverty of Christ.[4]

Into the philosophical aspects[5] of this question as to Unity of

---

1 Cf. H. W. C. Davis (editor), *Medieval England* (Oxford, 1924), pp. 397-400.

2 *Fratris Johannis Pecham . . . Tractatus tres,* pp. 98, 115, and 119. See also the list of titles given in the bibliography *s. v.* Pecham, Jean, in the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique,* fascicule C, col. 139-40.

3 *Ibid.,* p. 120.

4 Capes, *op. cit.,* p. 312.

5 These have been discussed at length by Callebaut, "Jean Pecham, O. F. M. et L'Augustinisme," in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum,* vol. xviii (1925), pp.

Form it is not essential for this study to go further than to quote the words of Hutton:

> "The Franciscans had been the more conservative of the two Mendicant Orders. . . . In fact, they were still Augustinian and in opposition to the innovations of St. Thomas. . . . The real quarrel soon showed itself to be concerned with the Thomist views as to the principle of individuation and the unity of Form. . . . That Thomist doctrine had been attacked by Bacon and by Peckham. . . . St. Thomas maintains that there is but one substantial form in man which constitutes his humanity, the rational soul."[6]

This teaching, current at Oxford,[7] seems to have tended to undermine the philosophical supports of the doctrine of the Real Presence[8] and thus to imperil the sense of awe with which the Mass was commonly regarded. Peckham demanded that the erroneous teaching be stopped at once,[9] and a year and a half later[10] he secured the official condemnation of several related opinions, of which the eighth was "quod in homine est tantum una forma, scilicet anima rationalis, et nulla alia forma substantialis".[11] The gathering was a distinguished one, and in addition to the presence of three bishops, three diocesan officials, an archdeacon, a professor of civil law and "aliis pluribus solemnibus et venerabilibus personis in multitudine copiosa"[12] it is interesting to note also the presence of the Chancellor of the University of Oxford himself.[13]

The other way in which Peckham affected the curriculum at Oxford consisted in his requirement that additional textbooks be secured, *viz.*, a work by Papia, probably his *Vocabularium Latinum,* a book by Huguecio, probably his commentary on the Decretals, and the *Summa* of Gulielmus Brito Armoricus.[14] He mentioned these in connection with some books on Latin Grammar, which he felt was culpably neglected. His interest in Latin Gram-

---

441-72, and by others — see Callebaut's references. Cf. Also D. E. Sharp, *Franciscan Philosophy at Oxford in the Thirteenth Century,* pp. 176, 186-95, and 241. Other aspects are treated by Mandonnet in his *Siger de Brabant,* part 1, especially pp. 91-102.

6 Edward Hutton, *The Franciscans in England* (London: Constable & Co., Ltd., [1926]), pp. 153-4.

7 *Reg.,* pp. 841, 866, 871, and 899f.

8 Cf. Martin, in *Reg.,* vol. iii, p. xxxv.

9 November, 1284. See *Reg.,* p. 841.

10 April, 1286. See *Reg.,* p. 921f.

11 *Reg.,* p. 923.

12 *Reg.,* p. 921.

13 *Loc. cit.*

14 *Reg.,* p. 813 (misprinted 138).

mar arose from his grave disapproval of the failure to employ Latin in the regular instruction being given in Merton College,[15] a matter which introduces the group of changes in the administration which Peckham sought to effect at this time.

Leach describes the outcome of the primate's visit to Merton, Oxford, as follows:—[16]

> "Friar John Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury, as a result of a visitation of the College on 31 August, 1824, issued an amended 'rule' in seventeen chapters. In Chapter iii. he says: 'Moreover the institutor of your college'—the earliest use of the word in relation to the house—'seeing that the clerks of England for the most part stutter and stammer in talking Latin' ordered that grammar pupils should be maintained under a grammar master, to be encouraged by a storehouse of grammar books; and commanded 'you to talk Latin (*loqui literaliter*) which hitherto has been neglected.' The Visitor therefore orders this to be amended as soon as possible and the books of Papias and Hugucio and Brito's *Summa* to be bought and chained on a proper desk. After reprobating other breaches of the Rule, the Visitor returned again to the grammar boys in Chapter xii. In many ways, he says, the Fellows have departed from the holy purpose of the founder. In the first place, they were only to admit the poor and not those who had sufficient means of their own or their parents' or who could by industry or favour provide for their own needs. In view of the founder's kin provisions, it is probable that the ex-mendicant friar was straining the word 'poor' . . . out of all relation to the founder's real intention. The second breach is, says the Visitor, that against the intention of the rule, the Fellows were not willing to admit youths (*adolescentes*) able to become proficient, but only those already advanced in learning, whereas they ought, as above said, to admit those learning the rudiments of grammar, and he blames them for not admitting boys of the family of the founder.
>
> "That the Visitor's strictures were effective is shown by the accounts for 1290. There were then thirteen boys of founder's kin. . . ."[17]

Many and varied were the alterations which Peckham sought to effect in the administration at Oxford. Several of his orders affected the general educational program and had little if any significance for religious education, e. g., his request that the endow-

---

[15] But Leach (*Educational Charters* [Cambridge, 1911], pp. 182-3) quotes the Statutes as "Latino fruantur eloquio seu idiomate vulgari," and interprets "the vulgar idiom" as being French.

[16] *Schools of Medieval England* (London, [1915]), p. 172f. [Quoted with the permission of Methuen & Co., Ltd., publishers.]

[17] This provision occurs in Chapter 40 of the Statutes of Merton College, and is given by Leach in his *Educational Charters,* pp. 184-5.

ment be administered more efficiently at Merton College,[18] his demand that refractory and insubordinate students be expelled,[19] and his insistence that preference be given to needy students if they were promising scholars even if they were only beginners.[20]

Some others of his regulations may have possessed a real significance for religious education if more of the related facts were known, e. g., his decree that medical students must be excluded from Merton College[21] and that those students who are being allured by the fields of law must also do some theological work throughout the rest of their stay in Merton.[22] It must not be concluded from this, however, that the archbishop was hostile to the university, for he had confirmed its special privileges as one of his first official acts;[23] he was in correspondence at this very time[24] with the Bishop of Lincoln (in whose diocese Oxford was at that time included) remonstrating with him for presuming to serve citations upon persons residing in the university who were therefore under the jurisdiction of the chancellor of the university and not under that of the Bishop of Lincoln; and he later[25] writes to the chancellor and the masters in a most fatherly fashion, urging them in the kindest way to abandon the plan of suspending their activities (*si . . . organa suspendatis*) and going upon a strike as a demonstration against the Bishop of Lincoln.

Another of Peckham's regulations which may have possessed some significance for theological education was his demand that Latin be resumed as the language of the classroom at Merton.[26] It seems reasonable to conclude that the better grounded in Latin were the young lads at Merton, the better equipped they would find themselves later when they entered upon their more strictly theological studies which were, of course, at that time conducted entirely in Latin.

Peckham resented also their indifference to the services of the church, the canonical "hours" which they were slighting, and quoted to them the scriptural assertion, "The dead praise not Thee,

---

18 *Reg.*, p. 813.

19 *Reg.*, pp. 815 and 818.

20 *Reg.*, p. 816.

21 *Reg.*, p. 812f.

22 "hiis . . . liceat tantum auditu theologico per residuum temporis indulgere."

23 July 31, 1279. See *Reg.*, p. 30f.

24 November, 1284. See *Reg.*, p. 857f.

25 January 27, 1285. See *Reg.*, p. 886f.

26 *Reg.*, p. 813 (misprinted 138).

O Lord; neither all they who go down into hell", intimating that they belonged in either one group or the other![27]

One other administrative matter received Peckham's attention, *viz.*, the neglected requirement of having a lector during the meal-hour to read aloud edifying passages from various authors while the others were eating. The Primate determined[28] that henceforth Merton College would have such a reader and that he was to read from Gregory's *Moralia*[29] or from "other edifying works which could be easily understood. The primate himself, however, would not be entitled to all the credit for any advantage accruing to religious education as a result of this reading, for he was merely insisting upon a more faithful observance of previously enacted rules.[30]

---

27 *Reg.*, p. 815.

28 *Reg.*, p. 815f. The reading was to be accorded respectful silence.

29 A work consisting of an elaborate commentary, expository in character, of the Book of Job.

30 For the precedent regarding Latin as the proper vehicle of instruction see the founder's stipulation, *Reg.*, p. 813: "vobisque loqui literaliter." For the existing rule regarding attendance at services, the *horas canonicas*, see *Reg.*, p. 815: "In hoc igitur sequamini regulae capitulum octavum." For previously enacted provision for the lector at meals, see *Reg.*, p. 815: "et nonum (capitulum) etiam." For the existing regulation regarding the silence during the lection, see *Reg.*, p. 816: "juxta regulae nonum capitulum."

IV.

ON BEHALF OF THE LAITY

1. The Constitutions of Lambeth

Peckham's outstanding contribution to the advancement of religious education is to be found in his Lambeth Constitutions promulgated at a provincial council held in 1281. These affected the laity in many different ways, some of which are not always thought of to-day as integral parts of a program of religious education. But since the conception of religious education adopted in this study embraces everything which is designed to affect conduct in its moral and religious aspects, and since many of these Lambeth Constitutions were designed to affect conduct along these lines, the Constitutions themselves are here regarded as possessing educational significance for the times for which they were enacted.

So many of the Lambeth Constitutions affected conduct along lines now administered by other agencies, that it is of the utmost importance to realize that the rôle of the Church as an agent of social (and hence of educational) control in the thirteenth century was vastly greater than it is today.[1] The Catholic Church in Peckham's time entered very deeply into the intimate, personal and domestic life of the laity, and through its rules and discipline it supplied much of that education and socialization which in later times came to be provided formally by schools.

The educational function of the church was thus conceived in larger terms than those prevailing today. In the time of Archbishop Peckham it was the Church which presided over the formulation and elevation of social customs; which conducted many of the law-suits in which the laity were involved; which licensed midwives and forbade mothers sleeping with their own infants; which combatted lasciviousness and punished lewdness with a rigor unknown today; which could ostracize a disobedient layman with an effectiveness which struck terror to his heart; and which undertook many other functions now performed by secularized schools or entrusted to the general influence of the social environment. If the layman attended a fair or witnessed a pageant, both fair and pageant had probably owed their inception to the Church and were conducted under its aegis. If the laborer had a holiday, it was only because the Church was giving him a holy-day, a day on

[1] Cf. Capes, *op. cit.*, pp. 234, 272, and 365-375.

which even the lord of the manor might not rightfully detain the peasant from church attendance and some measure of recreation.

The Church with its elaborate program of sacrament and service permeated all the levels of society and exerted its influence along channels later to be abandoned to such secular agencies as public schools, civil law-courts, the medical profession, and that formative power which the more advanced social order of later centuries has become able to exert. It is therefore reasonable to find the Church in Peckham's day exerting pressure and affecting the conduct and character of the laity along many avenues now no longer regarded as the Church's exclusive prerogatives. Many of these avenues appear in these Constitutions of Lambeth and are worthy of consideration in a study of religious education conceived in the broad and inclusive terms appropriate to the period with which this study is concerned.

Because of the remarkable influence of these Constitutions for over two hundred years upon ecclesiastical legislation and also upon clerical manuals, curricula, &c., it has seemed advisable to present here a brief synopsis of such of the articles as have a bearing upon the religious education of the laity.

The first article, "De custodia eucharistiae", dealt first with matter pertaining to the clergy, and then proceeded to bring the Eucharist into close touch with the daily life of the common people by ordering that a bell should be rung at the elevation of the Host, so that the people who were unable to be present every day at mass may kneel down wherever they happened to be—laboring in the fields or at work indoors—and thus gain the indulgences granted to such an act of devotion. It is reasonable to suppose that this brought the Eucharist frequently to the minds of all classes of people, and that in some cases it also brought thoughts of the sacrificial death of Christ, which the service was commemorating.

The next provision of this article had to do with the carrying of the Viaticum to the sick, thus touching the life of the average layman and possessing significance for religious education. Reverence for the sacrament would scarcely be inculcated by its being carried in a slovenly or casual manner; so Peckham required the observance of those regulations which he had promulgated at London.[2] These required the priest to wear his surplice and stole and to be preceded by a lighted lantern and little bell "ut populus ad orandum excitetur, ubicunque regem gloriae sub panis latibulo

---

[2] See note "p" in Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 52; also Martin's preface (*Reg.,* vol. iii) pp. cxxx and cxxxiii for more recent designations of the MSS.

eveniet deportari", unless prevented by the remoteness of the place or by some other valid obstacle.

Teaching was to be an integral part of the work of the clergy; they were to be religious educators. They are ordered to instruct carefully the simple folk when they receive communion, either at Easter or at any other time, that under the appearance of bread they receive both the body and the blood of the Lord, "Christum integrum, vivum et verum".[3] They are also to teach these simple folk that what is then delivered to them in the chalice is not the sacrament but simply wine to be drunk by them, given to them so that they may more easily swallow the sacred Body which they have just received.[4] Peckham insisted that no one should be permitted to receive the Holy Communion without having made the necessary preparation by going to confession,[5] and thus he brought the Sacrament of the Altar into touch with the inner spiritual life of the ordinary layman.

The next article, "De annualibus et anniversariis celebrandis", dealt mainly with the clergy and affected the laity only indirectly and by its implications. Priests were not to be so busy celebrating masses for particular persons or for special intentions[6] that they would neglect the regular duties of their parish. This regulation would tend to protect the layman in his claim upon the rightful ministrations of his pastor. Peckham also forbade a priest saying only one mass for two people when he had promised to say a mass for each person. This, too, provided protection to the laity from the greed or the sloth[7] of irresponsible or deceitful clergymen. The article concludes with a ruling that those priests who persist in this reprehensible practise shall be fined, the fine going to the poor of the parish, and that the grafters (*fraudatores fidelium*) were to be severely corrected by their Ordinaries.

The next article, "De baptismo", deals entirely with the laity, for all persons receiving the sacrament of baptism were, at the time of its reception, in the body of the laity. Peckham states[8] that there was a great deal of carelessness prevalent at that time in this matter of baptism. Acknowledging that there were times when members of the laity, men or women, were allowed to administer

---

3 Wilkins, *loc. cit.*

4 Interesting glosses on these passages are given by Lyndwood in his *Provinciale,* p. 8f.

5 Cf. "Parochiales insuper sacerdotes caveant diligenter, ne alicui dent corpus Domini, nisi prius constet eis ipsum fuisse confessum" — *loc. cit.*

6 Cf. Gasquet, *Parish Life,* p. 86.

7 Cf. "ex certa malitia vel accidia" — Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 52.

8 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 53.

the sacrament to little children at the point of death and to others in cases of necessity, Peckham proceeds to censure the practise indulged in by some of the dense and obtuse clergy (*quidam stolidi sacerdotes*) of re-baptizing[9] infants who had received a perfectly valid baptism, even though it was received from the hand of a layman. The primate sternly forbade this abuse of the sacrament in the future, ordering in its place the pronouncement of exorcisms and catechisms[10] upon those thus baptized.

Peckham expounds the theological doctrine concerning baptism to this extent: the correct form consists not only in certain words but in the order in which they are employed. The archbishop makes it clear that the language used has no invalidating effect upon the sacrament provided the correct form is used. He goes on to give the proper form, first in English: "Ich cristin the in the faderes name", &c.,[11] and then in French: "Je baptize tey en noun del peere", &c.

Maskell comments[12] upon this passage as follows: —

> "This constitution offers a curious proof of the then common use of French in certain ranks of the people. The form is supplied also in that language. So, also, some fifty years earlier, the form in marriage is ordered by a canon of a synod of Durham . . . . to be taught by priests in French[13] or English."

If the priest has any reasonable doubt that the infant has been baptized with the valid formula (*in forma debita*), he is to administer "hypothetical baptism".[14]

Peckham concluded this article with a warning to all priests not to permit the laity to give silly or suggestive (*lasciva*) names

---

9 Previously forbidden by Peckham at Reading; *ibid.*, p. 36.

10 "dicantur exorcismi et catechismi" — *loc. cit.* Cf. also his injunction at Reading that, in the case of infants born within a week before Easter or Pentecost and reserved for baptism until the eve of the feast-day, they shall receive "perfectum catechismum." Note: the word *catechismus* had the meaning of "sponsorship — from the questioning or catechising of the sponsors, which was a necessary preliminary to baptism" — See *The Lay Folks' Catechism, E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 118, p. xxx, note 2.

11 MSS. "Lambeth n. 17" and "Elien. n. 235" (Wilkins' notation) have: "y crysten the in the name of the fadyr, and the sone, and the holy goost." Peckham may have wished to make provision even for dialectal variations when he inserted "vel aliter in lingua materna secundum patriae consuetudinem," for the Lambeth MS. reads "secundum loquelam patriae." See Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 53, text and notes "i" and "k."

12 In *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1882) vol. i, p. ccli, note 36.

13 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. i, p. 582.

14 "si non es baptizatus, ego te baptizo in nomine Patris . . . ."

to children at baptism, especially to little girls. Commenting upon this injunction, Maskel says:

> "Lyndwood observes upon this that the priest, and not the parents, has the power of deciding upon the name to be given to the child, if he objects to that which is proposed by them."[15]

The significance which this order possessed for the laity is none the less real, however, for it was calculated to teach them not to derogate from the inherent sacredness of every individual by fastening upon him (or her) some trivial name to be borne through life. The kindly and sensible archbishop added that if this requirement were not observed, the lewd or freakish name must be changed by the bishop when he later confirms the child,[16] a matter which logically introduced the next succeeding article, "De sacramento confirmationis".

Confirmation was being rashly neglected by many at this time[17] and many children had grown to be old men and women without having received this sacrament; so Peckham undertakes to correct this damnable negligence (*negligentiae damnabili*) by decreeing that none shall be admitted to the sacrament of the Holy Communion unless he has been confirmed. Two exceptions only are to be permitted: if the person be in imminent peril of death, or if he has been actually prevented in some very real way (*rationabiliter*) from receiving confirmation. This requirement was calculated to bring many people who had become neglectful of their religious life into contact with one more sacrament; and as each sacrament was considered a channel of God's grace, the effect of receiving confirmation must have meant something in the spiritual lives of many. It brought the child into personal touch with the bishop, a prince of the Church and a peer of the Realm, and helped the child to realize more completely his incorporation into a vast, world-wide organization.

Article V refers exclusively to the lower ranks of the clergy,[18] and Article VI deals with technicalities which render a priest unable to absolve *de jure* and which disqualify him from hearing confessions.

Article VII, however, includes the laity in its scope. It demands the restoration of the form of punishment known as the

---

15 *Op. cit.*, p. cclii. The reference to Lyndwood's *Provinciale* which Maskell cites is Lib. 3. tit. 24. Circa sacramentum, *verb.* "Sacerdotes."

16 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 53.

17 "Confirmationis . . . sacramentum multi negligunt temerarie . . . . adeo ut plures, immo innumeri sint inveterati . . . qui nondum confirmationis gratiam receperunt," *loc. cit.*

18 "Ne quinque ordines simul conferantur."

"solemn penitence" prescribed by the sacred canons but consigned to oblivion with the result that a veritable crime wave had ensued.[19] It was the church's disciplinary measure in cases of incest and those most revolting crimes which stir a whole community, and this decree was designed to check the growing crime wave by imposing a penalty of such severity that it would deter the criminal from committing his evil deed.

Article VIII refers exclusively to the clergy. It recalls from innocuous desuetude (*a dissuetudine revocantes*) an order of the holy fathers that in every deanery a clergyman of outstanding sanctity should be appointed as a more or less official confessor for all the rectors, vicars, priests and other ministers of the church residing in that deanery.

With Article IX we come to a group of decrees (articles IX-XIII)[20] which constitute a sort of treatise or compendium of Christian doctrine which Peckham decreed was to be learned by the clergy and taught to the entire body of the laity. It is this requirement of definite religious instruction four times a year which constitutes Peckham's chief contribution to the advancement of religious education. It is for this treatise and its "enacting clause" or preamble with which it opens[21] that Peckham is chiefly remembered by posterity, and which seems to have exerted more influence than any of the other educational reforms undertaken by the Primate.

In brief, it runs in the name of the Archbishop, who begins by stating his desire to remedy present evils which he traces directly to the ignorance of both priest and people. Therefore he directs that every priest shall explain to his flock simply and clearly, four times a year, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the two precepts of the Gospel, the seven works of mercy, the seven deadly sins, the seven cardinal virtues, and the seven sacraments of grace. Furthermore, lest any priest should put forward the excuse of ignorance, the Archbishop subjoins brief summaries of each of these subjects of instruction. The exposition of these elements of faith and practice[22] constitutes the treatise.

---

19 "crevisse per consequens audacia hujusmodi horrenda facinora et flagitia perpetrandi," Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 54.

20 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, pp. 54-56.

21 "Ignorantia sacerdotum populum praecipitat in foveam erroris . . . . in quorum remedium statuendo praecipimus, ut quilibet sacerdos plebi praesidens, tatis textura fantastica, quatuordecim fidei articulos . . . ." — *Ibid.,* p. 54.

22 H. E. Nolloth in Introduction to *The Lay Folks' Catechism, E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 118, p. xii.

It seems certain that Peckham aimed to have this religious instruction given in sermons cast in the form of doctrinal instructions. In this reliance upon sermons, Peckham was reflecting the prevailing attitude of his own Order, for the Franciscans attached great importance to preaching;[23] and the evangelical spirit of their preaching was not unlike the emphasis later to be placed by the leaders of the Reformation upon "the preaching of the Word of God". Little maintains[24] that some Franciscans considered that attendance at sermons was more valuable than attendance at mass, and quotes St. Bernardino of Siena as having said: "If of these two things you can only do one—either hear the mass or hear the sermon—you should let the mass go rather than the sermon". Little also maintains that church-going increased in the later Middle Ages and attributes the growth of this religious practice to the influence of the friars, an influence traceable partly to Peckham and his constitutions.

"Now it is obvious," says Gasquet,[25] "that if four times a year this law was complied with . . . the people were very thoroughly instructed in their faith". To cover this ground once would require several Sundays or solemn feast days, and the Constitution itself contemplates instruction being given on "one *or more*" of such days.

Article XIV of the Lambeth Constitutions[26] contains a list of eleven groups of infractions of the church's laws or prerogatives which are to be punished with excommunication. These same infringements of the church's rights had been previously set forth at Reading[27] as worthy of the penalty of excommunication. As these infringements relate to deeds perpetrated by the laity, as well as by the clergy, and are in fact aimed primarily at those members of the laity who were inclined to support the king rather than the church, it has seemed wise to indicate briefly the contents of each of the excommunications pronounced at Lambeth.

First. Any who hinder the prosecution of ecclesiastical cases by securing writs or judgments from lay courts. This was designed to preserve intact the judiciary prerogatives of the church and thus to enhance its prestige in the eyes of the laity. It would also en-

---

23 Little, *Studies in English Franciscan History,* pp. 131-5.

24 *Loc. cit.* Cf. also Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England,* p. 93f and references.

25 *Parish Life,* p. 215.

26 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 56: "De sententia excommunicationis publicanda."

27 Peckham had arrived in England in June (1279). Almost his first official action had been to summon a council to meet with him at Reading in July. In the Lambeth list, the "Secundo" and the "Tertio" of the Reading list have merely shifted their relative positions. See *ibid.,* p. 35f and p. 56f.

courage them to place more reliance and confidence in the ecclesiastical courts.

Second. Any who disturb the peace and tranquillity of the realm. This was explained so as to include not only insurgents but also all thieves and robbers and outlaws.

Third. Any who give false testimony, etc. This would tend to discourage perjury and to promote truthfulness.

Fourth. Any lawyers who maliciously complicated matrimonial or other cases so as to delay a decision which would be in favor of the church. Here Peckham was taking a stand, not only for the rights of the church, but also for the advancement of probity and honesty in the legal profession. This step would also possess a reflex influence upon the esteem and sacredness in which marriage was held at that time.

Fifth. Any who because of their chance to gain some personal profit or to gratify their hatred or to secure favor maliciously accuse a person of some crime so that upright and substantial members of a community are stigmatized and compelled to undergo purgation or some other burden. This action on Peckham's part would probably have a good and sobering effect upon many communities. It would tend to discourage slander and libel, and would thus be a measure on behalf of a higher type of character, thus possessing significance for religious education.

Sixth. Any who oppose (or cause to be opposed) the *quaestio* of the *de jure* patron of a vacant church in such a way as to impede his collation of that church promptly. This, again, was a step designed to promote uprightness and probity among all parties concerned.

Seventh. Any who maliciously disregard the commands of the king in connection with the arrest of excommunicated persons or who hinder their arrest or who procure their wrongful release from arrest contrary to the decrees of ecclesiastical discipline. This served to safe-guard the rights of the church with regard to the secular arm being brought to bear upon excommunicated persons and thus to dissuade people from committing crimes with the hope that the civil power would procure their release.

Eighth. Any who receive bribes. The implications of this bit of legislation would seem to be quite clear. It was a step on behalf of character education, as it were.

Ninth. Any who carry off or consume anything belonging to the houses, manors, granges or other places owned by archbishops, bishops, or other ecclesiastical persons contrary to their wishes or who injure such property. This decree promoted a wholesome re-

spect for the property rights of others and tended to discourage petty theft and pilfering. Such purposes are not unrelated to character education.

Tenth. Any who violently remove a culprit who has fled to a church, cemetery or cloister, and also any who prevent necessary food being given to such a man. Also any who carry off things belonging to others which have been deposited in such places or who are in any way implicated in such removal of property. The implications for religious education of this provision are so extended that they receive special consideration under the head, "Upheld the 'Right of Sanctuary' " in a following section of this study.

Eleventh. Any who impugn the Magna Charta. This was a bold step and it had already got Peckham into trouble when this provision had been included in the Reading Constitutions two years earlier. In this earlier case, Peckham had gone so far as to order every cathedral and collegiate church to display prominently a copy of the Magna Charta where it would strike the eye of all entering the building.[28] The copy was to be written carefully and clearly and was to be renewed annually so that the writing would always be legible and not blurred by the effects of the weather.

This public posting of the Magna Charta where all the laity could see it frequently must have had an educational effect even upon those who could not read. But Stubbs regards it[29] as having been motivated solely by political reasons, and he describes it[30] as an attempt "to get up a constitutional outcry against Edward I. during the most important legislative part of his reign. In this the king got the better, for he not only persisted in issuing orders to the prelates not to make statutes or constitutions in disparagement of the national law and royal right, but he compelled the enterprising prelate to retract and annul some of the constitutions which he had made". The removal of the copies of the Magna Charta from the doors of the churches is found in Close Roll 7 Edw. I. m. l. dorso.[31] This zeal on the primate's part seems to have provided the king with a favorable opportunity to advance his own side of the perennial contest between Church and State by calling forth a general attitude of mind on the part of the body politic which ren-

---

28 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 36.

29 In his *Lectures on Early English History* (London and New York, 1906), p. 105.

30 *Loc. cit.*

31 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 40. Cf. also *Calendar of the Close Rolls; Edward I.* (London, 1900), vol. i, p. 582. For the view that this retraction was only a temporary defeat, see Hilda Johnstone, *Archbishop Pecham and the Council of Lambeth of* 1281, p. 172f.; in *Essays in Medieval History presented to Thomas Frederick Tout.*

dered it safe for the king to promulgate[32] the famous statute "De religiosis", more commonly known as the Statute of Mortmain.[33]

It is interesting to note, however, that Peckham's successor, Robert Winchelsey, sent a mandate to his Commissary to publish in every church of the diocese of Canterbury that persons who infringed the liberties of the Church, which were explicitly guarded by certain clauses in the Magna Charta and by later confirmations of the Great Charter, would incur sentence of excommunication.[34]

The remaining articles of the Lambeth Constitutions possessed no discernible significance for the religious education of the laity, with the possible exception of the provision in cap. xix that four parishioners of high standing are always to see that generous provision for the poor of the parish is definitely made whenever the sources of income for a church are farmed out by a (non-resident) rector.[35]

2. Other constructive measures.

The Church still presided at this period over the fortunes and destinies of the whole social order;[36] and Peckham presided over the Province of Canterbury in the *ecclesia anglicana.*[37] It would not seem unreasonable to expect to find that his influence had far-reaching effects upon the devotional life of the people. The sources from which their devotions sprang were many and diverse, and they have been ably summed up by Welter as follows:—

"Il est sans doute difficile de se faire aujourd'hui une idée

---

32 Cf. W. Stubbs, *Constitutional History of England* (Oxford, 1887-1903), vol. ii, pp. 109-112, where Stubbs states that in England, as elsewhere, this particular century was a period of legal definition of duties and of spheres of duties. Edward I. was by nature a lawgiver and he instituted a series of legal reforms which gained for him the title of the English Justinian. The first half of his reign, embracing Peckham's primacy, was mainly occupied with this work.

33 Easily accessible in Henry Gee and W. J. Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1921), p. 81f.

34 The mandate was to be published "pulsatis campanis candelis accensis," but no mention is made of any directions to post the Charter upon the doors of the churches. See *Diœcesis Cantuariensis: Registrum Roberti Winchelsey* (Canterbury and York Society, 1928), part 82, p. 409f.

35 Capes, *op. cit.*, p. 264; and Gasquet, *Parish Life,* p. 19.

36 How intimately the Church entered into the intimacies of domestic life may be seen from one of the Constitutions of the Synod of Sodor (Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 177): "Inhibemus sub poena excommunicationis, ne aliquae mulieres vel uxores parvulos suos in lectulis suis secum collocari permittant, antequam aetatis suae tertium annum expleverint." (A. D. 1291). Cf. the similar injunction of Walter de Cantilupe in A. D. 1240, which concluded with the additional direction, "sed in cunabilis firmiter jaceant fulciendis," given by Wilkins in his *Concilia,* vol. i, p. 668. Attention to such a detail of domestic life is particularly significant coming from a group of men all of whom were presumably bachelors. Cf. also Capes, *op. cit.*, p. 371.

37 Cf. *Reg.*, p. 858. As to the degree of "independence" enjoyed by the *ecclesia anglicana,* see Appendix II.

exacte de l'influence qu'ont dû exercer sur la sensibilité et l'imagination des masses populaires ces récits de miracles, présentés sous forme pathétique et dramatisés à loisir pour produire l'effet voulu. Il est probable que les dévotions secondaires telles que celle du sang du crucifié, de ses plaies, et de son coeur ont eu également une grande vogue parmi les fidèles. . . . Si l'on ajoute à cela (la dévotion du Sacré-Cœur), le culte des morts et des âmes du purgatoire, les encourgaments donnés aux fidèles à prendre la croix pour la délivrance de la terre sainte, l'usage pieux des sacrementaux, on a à peu près épuisé tout ce qui fait le fonds des dévotions du peuple anglais sous le règne d'Edouard I."[38]

Not only did Peckham decree[39] that the Blessed Sacrament should be reserved with great care and fitting reverence and that when the priest carried it to the sick the entire procedure should be accompanied with reverence and dignity, but he also insisted that the sacrament be at all times available for the sick (*parochianis infirmis semper viaticum sit paratum*).[40] While the educational value of this regulation may appear neither obvious nor significant, nevertheless his insistence upon this detail may well have served to impress the importance of this sacrament upon the minds of many of the laity; and, at least in the case cited, it may have resulted in the Church's being able to assist and comfort the sick and dying by its official ministrations, which unquestionably possessed educational value *in se*.[41]

Capes, too, testifies[42] to the far-reaching influence of the church at this time.

> "The Church itself, as a visible institution, stretching through Western Christendom in her yet unbroken unity, appealed with overpowering force to the imagination of her children. Her ceremonies were associated with every important phase of private life from the cradle to the grave; her cathedrals and parish churches were the only public buildings to which every class had the same rights and opportunities of access; in a society deeply scored with the lines of class distinctions all could meet there on the same common level. Only through her service could men of low degree rise to the highest offices of State; her sanctuaries

---

38 J. Th. Welter, in preface to *Le Speculum Laicorum* (Paris, 1914), pp. xxxvi-xxxvii.

39 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, pp. 48 and 52.

40 *Reg.,* p. 506.

41 Cf. Hist. MSS. Comm., Report IX, p. 73: "Ordinacio Johannis Archiepi. de ecclesiis et vicariis de Terryng et Pachyngg . . . . a scheme for the better providing for divine service in the parishes . . . . By it two separate churches were established, each with its proper vicar and revenues."

42 *Op. cit.,* vol. iii, p. 365.

alone could give a passing shelter to the hunted criminal or outlaw; her holidays alone brought rest and freedom to the serf."

The church building possessed great educational value. Often richly decorated with the offerings of many generations, its chancel walls were lined with the choicest tapestry, the finest embroidery graced its altar, and its decorations not infrequently exceeded in costliness and splendor anything which could be found elsewhere except here and there in a royal palace or a great nobleman's mansion.[43]

The ornate services of the catholic church were not without their educational import, and the ritual of the Mass involved many symbolic accessories possessing much instructive value. Elaborate services of great variety required various articles technically known as "ornaments". Questions were continually arising as to whether the rector or the parishioners should be held responsible for these ornaments; and, of course, the greater the number of ornaments provided by the laity, the greater became the number of points at which the church touched their lives.[44]

So it is significant that Peckham promulgated a canon[45] requiring the parishioners to provide the chalice, the missal, the principal mass-vestment, *viz.,* chasuble, clean alb, amice, maniple, girdle and two towels, a large cross for processions, a lesser cross for the dead, a lantern with a bell, a thurible, a lenten veil, banners, bells, *manuales pro mortuis,* a bier, a vessel for holy water, an osculatory for the Pax, a candlestick for the Pascal candle, bells in the steeple and ropes for them, a holy font with locks, repairs to the nave of the church (within and without) as well as altars, images, windows, glass and the locks of the churchyard.

Some of the vestments worn at that time were of great costliness. As an indication of the cost of those worn by Peckham himself, it is possible to cite the exact price which he paid for a mitre in 1288. A warrant[46] dated March 31, 1288, states the cost of the

---

[43] Cf. *ibid.,* p. 374.

[44] But see Coulton, *The Medieval Village* (Cambridge: University Press, 1925), p. 257f, for the view that ordinary lay-folk understood very little of the meaning of the services.

[45] This canon is of uncertain time and place. It was probably a regulation made by Peckham at some visitation, stating a minimum which became the accepted norm throughout the entire province in time. See Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops,* p. 348, note. The canon is printed in Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 49, under the title, Statuta Quaedam Johannis Peckham Cant. archiepiscopi. Martin (*Reg.,* vol. iii, pp. cxl-cxlii) gives some slightly variant lists found in MSS. not followed by Wilkins.

[46] *Reg.,* p. 957f.

mitre as 173*l.* 4*s.* 1*d.* It is difficult to ascertain the multiple by which to translate these figures into modern currency. It has been variously stated as from twelve to twenty-four,[47] but even employing the lower of these two figures, the cost of this mitre reaches an almost staggering figure. It was expended for gold and stones and other necessary material and it also covered the labor involved in making it. Even though this piece of ecclesiastical apparel was for the archbishop, it nevertheless is a significant index of the probably relative costliness, on a descending scale, of the vestments and "ornaments" which the laity had to provide for their own parish priests.[48]

A somewhat unusual situation arose at Sele in connection with this question of repairs to certain parts of the church equipment. There were originally two churches at Sele, one conventual and one parish church. It seems that the parish church became unfit for use and the parishioners came to worship in the conventual church. A dispute arose over expenses to be paid by the parishioners, a commission was appointed to look into the matter, and its decision was that the parishioners "were liable to the immediate reparation, when needed, of the nave, the belfry, the bells, the bell-ropes, and the clock, under penalty of 40s.; and with this, after some resistance, the parishioners reluctantly complied".[49] A deed among the records of the Priory of St. Peter at Sele is reported[50] to indicate that this decision was confirmed by Archbishop Peckham in 1283.

That the responsibility for providing for the repairs or rebuilding when required fell upon the parishioners is corroborated by Capes: If the necessary work was not done promptly, the bishop sent a mandate specifying the work to be done, the time-limit allowed, and the penalties if neglect continued. Town councils sometimes portioned out the work among the people, assigning some to dig the stone, others to cart it from the quarries, and reporting miserly parishioners to the archdeacons. If the parish were really too poor to bear the burden unassisted, appeals were made in a wider area, subscriptions were authorized in larger centers, and agents, *quaestors,* licensed to receive additional funds. Some penances could be commuted into fines to be turned over to the fabric fund; priests were urged to press the good cause upon the notice

---

47 Capes, *op. cit.,* p. 29. Cf. *ibid.,* p. 275. See also Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops,* vol. iii, pp. 348 and 353; and Cutts, *op. cit.,* pp. 386f and 404f.

48 For vestments owned by Bishop Ginsborough about this same time, see his *Register* (Willis-Bund, editor), p. 56f.

49 *Sussex Archeological Collections,* vol. x (1858), p. 104.

50 *Loc. cit.*

of the dying; and estates of intestates were not infrequently devoted to this undertaking.[51]

There was prevalent a curious medley of awe and irreverence in the attitude which the laity exhibited toward the church building. Sometimes parishioners stored their grain and straw within its walls, public markets were held within its sacred precincts, town accounts were audited and cases of assault were tried in its aisles. Yet strong local pride in the church edifice was everywhere evident, and the common people made many sacrifices in order to beautify and adorn the structure with elaborate wood-carvings, exquisite windows, magnificent altars, gold and silver vessels, silk and velvet vestments, &c.[52]

Every article, vestment, banner, hanging, chalice, &c., brought to the worshipper's mind not only the memory of the original donor,[53] but also some portion, perhaps small but none the less real, of the teaching of the Church and thus possessed genuine educational value. This ruling of Archbishop Peckham remained in force until the Reformation,[54] altho Winchelsey, Peckham's successor in office, somewhat enlarged it in 1305, including several more articles to be provided by the parishioners.[55]

Peckham upheld the ancient privilege of the church to extend to its children the "right of sanctuary": any fugitive was entitled to claim the protection of the church if he fled to its sanctuary. This privilege was attached to all cathedrals, abbeys and to consecrated parish churches.[56] To drag a fugitive away from such a sanctuary was commonly regarded as an inexpiable crime; and in some places, e. g., Beverly, he was provided for thirty days with food and lodging within the minister's precincts, after which time he was granted safe conduct to the boundary line of the county.[57] It may easily be conjectured how intimately this privilege touched some of the laity and how gratefully a pursued villager, despairing of obtaining justice at the hands of an irate mob, gained the portal of some nearby church and claimed the protection of its sanctuary.

Archbishop Peckham championed this privilege of the common layman, upholding the rights of the church in this matter at

---

51 Capes, *op. cit.*, p. 267. At Plymouth, if the parishioner left the church less than twenty shillings, only the second-best cope could be used at his funeral, *loc. cit.* See also Gasquet, *Parish Life,* p. 132f.

52 Capes, *op. cit.*, pp. 266-7.

53 Gasquet, *Parish Life,* p. 40. See also pp. 1-8, 27-42, 69f, 102f *et passim.*

54 *Ibid.*, p. 32.

55 *Ibid.*, p. 33.

56 Capes, *op. cit.*, pp. 133 and 269f.

57 *Ibid.*, p. 269.

Reading[58] and later at Lambeth.[59] The following year (1282) he ordered[60] the excommunication of all those who had dragged a man from the parish church at Warblington in the diocese of Winchester, whither he had fled "pro immunitate habenda", and had then put him to death. That same year he also ordered[61] the excommunication of all who were implicated in a crime committed at St. Paul's, London, which of course possessed this *immunitatem libertatis ecclesiasticae.* The crime began with a "violentam extractationem confugientium ad eam (ecclesiam)" and ended with a brutal murder.

The following year Peckham ordered the monks at Leominster to build a chapel of respectable size, to which there should be free access at all times for refugees.[62] It seems plain that the archbishop was determined to preserve for the underprivileged laborer and the hotly pursued peasant the safety which alone the Church seemed willing or able to provide at that time. Yet this privilege of sanctuary was probably no real gain to the Church. It shocked common sense and the instincts of order, says Capes,[63] and encouraged ruffians and highway robbers in their crimes.

Peckham was no less a Franciscan than an archbishop, and he was always the Friars' champion. He was quite willing for the laity to go to friars to make their confessions and made his position in this matter quite clear on several occasions. In 1285 he ordered the archdeacon of Nottingham to forbid the rector of St. Peter's church, Nottingham and the vicar of St. Mary's church in the same place and also the vicar of Granby to continue their efforts to prevent the Friars Minors from hearing confessions.[64] In 1287 the archbishop wrote to the archdeacon of Canterbury requesting him to make it very clear that the friars of both preaching orders had "auctoritatem apostolicam ad confessiones audiendas et salutares poenitentias injungendas".[65]

The following year the primate wrote a most emphatic letter to the Dean of St. Paul's, asserting in no uncertain language that the Franciscans had full power from several of the popes to hear

---

58 See Constitutions of Reading, Art. X, "decimo," in Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 35.

59 See Constitutions of Lambeth, Art. XIV: "Item excommunicantur ab eodem quicunque abstrahunt violenter reum ad ecclesiam vel cœmeterium, vel claustrum fugientem, vel qui ei victum necessarium prohibent exhiberi."

60 *Reg.,* p. 311f.

61 *Reg.,* pp. 433-5, 523-5.

62 *Reg.,* pp. 505-7. Cf. also his injunctions to the Priory at Rochester, *ibid.,* p. 622f.

63 *Op. cit.,* pp. 133 and 269f.

64 *Reg.,* p. 877f.

65 *Reg.,* p. 952f.

the confessions of the faithful everywhere, to absolve them, and to enjoin salutary penances upon them quite irrespective of the recommendation or the licence of parochial priests.[66]

Various minor matters:—

Peckham believed that the laity should be taught to honor their promises and to keep their pledged word faithfully. If men had sworn to aid in the recovery of the Holy Land from the hated Saracen and had promised to bear arms only in that great Cause, the primate was unwilling that these same men should bear arms in tournaments. They had assumed the cross, had pledged themselves to refrain from reckless pastimes and such sports as might at any moment deprive the Church of a valiant and much-needed soldier, and they were to be taught to respect the sacredness of their pledged word.

He therefore took steps[67] to see that these men honored their vows; and thus he kept the Church and its aims constantly before their minds. The king, too, had "crossed himself for the Holy Land,"[68] and the prospect of another crusade was ever glowing on the distant horizon.[69] Toward the very end of his life, the Archbishop himself preached a crusade[70] and convened a synod of all the clergy of the province to meet on February 13, 1291, to consider the affairs of the Holy Land.[71]

The Archbishop also granted indulgences, and these must be included in any comprehensive survey of his influence as a religious educator. It must not, however, be imagined that the prelate was professing to relieve those who received his indulgences from part of their tortures later to be endured in purgatorial flames. The facts of the case are quite otherwise. Indulgences offered by bishops were releases from enjoined penances and nothing more.[72] Such indulgences remitted (for the period stated in them) any penances which had been or might be imposed in the confessional. "They

---

66 *Reg.*, p. 956f.

67 He wielded his usual weapon, the threat of excommunication. See *Reg.*, p. 775.

68 Prynne's *Records; or An exact chronological vindication,* &c. (London. 1670), vol.iii, p. 428. The original Latin form, *cruce-signatur,* occurs on p. 375 in the same connection. For meaning of this phrase, see *Vetus liber archdidiaconi eliensis,* p. 213. The phrases used by Peckham are *eos, qui se crucis signaculo munierunt,* and *cruce-signatus—loc. cit.*

69 Ottobon had preached a crusade in 1268. See *Flores Historiarum* (edition of 1570) p. 348.

70 Bartholomaeus de Cotton adds: "et plures magnates Angliae sumpserunt crucem." See *Hist. Angl.* (Rolls series), p. 177.

71 *Ibid.*, p. 206. See also *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* Third Series, vol. iii (1909), p. 138.

72 Capes, *op. cit.*, 326.

dealt merely with the outward forms of Church discipline, such as the early Penitentials had prescribed with great fulness of detail".[73]

Consequently we find Peckham granting an indulgence[74] for all those who pray in a certain place or with certain words (the Lord's prayer with a salutation to the glorious Virgin) for the soul of Beatrice, the daughter of Henry III. The exact words used are "quadraginta dies de injuncta sibi poenitentia relaxamus". Four years later he granted another indulgence[75] to all those who would fast the forty days preceding the feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin. The very wording of this indulgence was significant for religious education: "To all the children of Holy Mother the Church, Friar John sends greeting. No mortal on earth is able to venerate with adequate worship (*condignis cultibus*) the Mother of God, the Virgin glorious, now exalted to the throne of earth and heaven, whose power in [the new] Jerusalem is greater than that of all other created beings, than whose protecting patronage nothing less than God Himself can be more valuable. . . . Because the entire life of Saint Mary was one prolonged fast, for she took food only in order to ward off death, and never to please her palate, she became through her strict frugality and abstinence like a mere slender column of smoke. And also because of the fact that the most holy Father Blessed Francis fasted continuously from the feast of the Apostles even to the feast of the Assumption of the Virgin: [a fast which he accomplished] by clinging to her footprints; To promote the glory of so noble a queen, and in order to commend the example of the devout father, We grant by these present letters ten days of indulgence for every single day of fasting to all the faithful in Christ who are truly penitent and who make a continuous fast throughout the whole forty days preceding the feast of the afore-mentioned Assumption. . . . Upon those, however, who are hindered by bodily frailty and who therefore decide not to fast without a break but to interpolate a day with nourishment into the period of fasting every so often—upon these we bestow a similar grace of indulgence according to the number of the days kept fasting, who however would not have fasted without this special reason. Also to all who have this indulgence published on account of a desire to show her reverence we grant an equal grace just as often as they publish it reverently and devoutly before a multitude of the faithful. In testimony of which thing, &c.

---

[73] *Loc. cit.*

[74] *Reg.*, p. 33f.

[75] *Reg.*, p. 580f.

Dated at South Malling, July 7th., A. D. 1283, being the fifth year of our consecration."

It is clear from this indulgence and also from the frequent ending, "Valete in Christo et Virgine gloriosa", with which Peckham closed many of his letters,[76] that the kind of Christianity which he promoted gave a place of great dignity and honor to the Blessed Virgin.[77]

Peckham set his face sternly against anything which would seem to place the Church in the position of an oppressor of the under-privileged. He was a champion of the poor in many suits where his own subordinate clergy were the aggressors.[78] Whether such action on his part possesses more significance for Peckham's own character or for his conception of the proper position of the Church in the lives and thoughts of the people—and hence for a study in religious education—may remain an open question; but it is certain that he sharply censured the abbot of Bristol for having taken from a poor man "more than 100% of usury, which even the civil law forbids to all men";[79] and that he protected the ordinary unprivileged layman against the loathsome cleric who figures in the unusually disgusting law-suit recorded in the *Registrum* on page 856, regarding which Coulton remarks: "Such incidents have come down to us, in the nature of the case, only where the scandal was very great and some really great prelate like Peckham was ready to interfere".[80]

Yet Peckham approved both implicitly[81] and explicitly[82] of the payment by the laity of the customary fees,[83] e. g., the *decimae dotalium bonorum* and the *Mortuaria,* and he permitted the Welsh to continue paying the latter in *vestibus et aliis.*[84]

In two other ways Peckham's interest in Wales assumed educational significance. He directed the attention of the Bishop of St. Asaph's to certain grave deficiencies in the Welsh educational system (if such it might be called), *viz.,* the lack of provision for the instruction of lads in grammar, and the lack of efforts to edu-

---

[76] E. g., *Reg.,* pp. 226, 265, 271, 285, 305, &c.

[77] This may well be an instance of his loyalty to the Franciscan Order. Cf. Owst, G. R., *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England* (Cambridge: University Press, 1933) p. 17f.

[78] See *Reg., passim.*

[79] *Reg.,* p. 68.

[80] *The Medieval Village,* p. 437 (Appendix 8).

[81] *Reg.,* p. 684.

[82] *Reg.,* p. 740.

[83] See Capes, *op. cit.,* p. 262f.; and cf. Gasquet, *Parish Life,* pp. 9-20.

[84] *Reg.,* p. 740.

cate the laity in matters of faith and morals.[85] This matter lay so heavily upon the conscience of the archbishop that a week later[86] he wrote a letter to the king himself, urging that the Welsh be compelled to send their children to England for a decent education to embrace both learning and manners,[87] and asserting that "never will this nation be in a state of prosperity or sure peace, or be profitable to the world until they dwell together[88] and work as other folk, and until they are educated by folk who can and will teach them".

Archbishop Peckham can hardly be called a church-builder, but he has to his credit a long and earnest letter[89] written to King Edward I., in which he pleads in most urgent but also most tactful language that his sovereign will feel it his sacred privilege to undertake the repair and restoration of the great damage which was done to the churches in Wales during the long war which had just closed.[90] The cathedral of St. Asaph had been burned down; ecclesiastical articles had been destroyed, books, chalices, bells, vessels, vestments and ornaments belonging to the churches had been stolen.[91] The Primate reminds the King that some of the Welsh people were entirely innocent, and that much of this damage was done by the king's own troops, although quite against his orders.

Peckham then appeals to the King:—"It is true that no civil or canon law seems to obligate you in any degree to make any compensation for the injured churches or for the losses suffered by ecclesiastical persons because of Llewellyn, former Prince of Wales, . . . but nevertheless because all His creatures serve the supreme Emperor, Who is in reality the Lord, we are convinced that it doth well become Your Majesty (which holds the heavy burden of terrestrial rule from the Supreme King) to make restoration, from the wealth entrusted to your management, for the injuries to the honor of your majesty recently perpetrated at the hands of its dis-

---

85 *Reg.*, p. 739.

86 July 4, 1284.

87 *Reg.*, p. 991f. Cf. p. 777.

88 The Welsh were maintaining a form of life called *Wysshanbaghan*, which Peckham ordered to be entirely abolished. This mode of living has been described as follows: "Each tenant under the prince was bound to present his son to the prince upon attaining the age of fourteen, at which period he became independent of his father. These youths were under the superintendence of the chief of the household, and passed their time in perambulating the country and marauding in the Marches." Aneurin Owen's Welsh Laws, p. 1002. See Martin's note, *Reg.*, p. 991.

89 *Reg.*, pp. 731-5.

90 A. D. 1284.

91 *Reg.*, p. 732.

pensor or, rather, its destroyer".[92] The king was moved by the appeal and consented to do something toward rehabilitating the damaged churches, and offered the Bishop of St. Asaph one thousand marks towards a new cathedral if it should be built in the new town of Rhuddlan; but for some reason the plan fell through and the king subscribed a hundred pounds towards the restoration of the old edifice.[93]

The Primate was deeply interested in education and he sought to promote it in several ways.[94] In 1280, he ordered the church of Bauquell to see that provision was made for having regular instruction on weekdays. For this church and the chapels annexed to it, Peckham gave orders that there should be "duos clericos scholasticos per parochianorum . . . eligendos, qui . . . pro Festis diebus disciplinis scholasticis indulgentes",[95] which Cutts translates[96] "and on weekdays should keep school".[97] In connection with this passage, presumably, Gasquet points out[98] that Archbishop Peckham felt that the parishioners themselves and not the rector or vicar should appoint the parish clerks, since those who pay the money should be allowed to elect to the office.[99] Peckham also appointed the Master of the Grammar School of the city and diocese of Norwich, when that see was vacant in 1288.[100]

Archbishop Peckham undertook some measures which appear to have possessed considerable educational significance, but which can hardly be classified as positive or constructive procedures. These were largely restrictive and disciplinary measures put forth by the Primate mainly in the form of prohibitions backed up by penalties of varying severity, and it is this negative point of view, educationally conceived, which seems to justify their separate classification. They were of varied nature and importance, ranging from his Mandate for the proper observance of Sunday[101] to his

---

92 Reg., p. 735.

93 See Martin, in *Reg.*, vol. ii, p. lvii and f.

94 His special provision for the school at Canterbury, where he appointed the masters, is reserved for mention under the head of restrictive and disciplinary measures.

95 Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum* (London, 1655-73), vol. iii, p. 226f.

96 *Op. cit.*, p. 303.

97 For other similar provisions, cf. *ibid.*, Chapter XX.

98 *Parish Life*, p. 114.

99 "Parochianorum de quorum habeant vivere elemosinis"—*loc. cit.*

100 See notice in *Reg.*, p. 1009. This entry has been printed in full in *Dioecesis Cantuariensis* (Canterbury and York series) pars prima, p. 76. For Peckham's interest in the school at Wells, see Reynolds, H. E., *Wells Cathedral* (Leeds [?], 1881), Appendix C, pp. 122-5.

101 *Reg.*, pp. 980-2.

condemnation of certain myths and superstitions in Wales.[102]

Peckham must receive credit for having exerted his official position on behalf of a more reverent observance of Sunday throughout his archdiocese of Canterbury. In 1291, he dispatched an injunction to his archdeacon, lamenting[103] the prevailing laxity in this regard and bewailing the continual infraction of the rules of the catholic life in this matter. He was particularly grieved at the sight of the constant breaking of the rules of the decalogue, so necessary for the attaining of eternal life. In this mandate he centers attention upon the divine precept concerning the preservation of the Sabbath from all servile work so that "in it the populace may cling to the rules of life as to mirrors of the supreme light with all their mind". In place of this (Jewish) Sabbath, he continues, the solemn services of the church and especially those of the Lord's Day have now been substituted. "In deep gratitude for this, and on behalf of the safety of the people, for which we shall be held responsible on the day of judgment, we decree that those solemnities are to be observed with all diligence, and we have procured a royal mandate for this same requirement, so that we may draw away from the disobedience involved in such sin the sons of Belial (if not by love and persuasion) at least by the fear of punishment. Nor is the mere publication of the divine commandments nor the faithful discharge of your own office sufficient to prevent these weak, lustful, scornful, pseudo-Christians from turning the solemn injunctions of the Church into a veritable reproach (to our religion), men having ears ever open to injurious things and ever deaf to matters pertaining to salvation, forgetful of their own salvation and holding in contempt the laws of the Most High. And therefore, since we do not possess the power to do anything more effective than this, we strictly enjoin upon you that you lead back your rebellious people, however violently they may struggle against you, to the proper observance of the solemn duties enjoined by the church, even if you have to use every kind of censure which the church places in your hand". The Primate requests an answer from the archdeacon before the feast of the Assumption, stating what he has been able to accomplish in this matter. The Archbishop concludes: "We entrust to your diligent attention the publication of this mandate and the proper execution of its contents, invoking against you the thunder of God's curse if you be neglectful or remiss in the discharge of these commands".

---

102 *Reg.*, pp. 741-2.

103 *Reg.*, p. 980f.

It is difficult to conceive of more emphatic or urgent language. To insure its really influencing the people, Peckham included in this injunction a penalty to be imposed upon all those who should prove to be contumacious, namely, that those who should persist in their disobedience and whom the spark of death-bed penitence did not soften should be deprived of ecclesiastical sepulture. This threat was likely to be a particularly effective one at that time, when the forfeiture of ecclesiastical burial was considered a penalty of tremendous weight.

This injunction leads on naturally to a consideration of other matters in which Peckham relied largely upon the fear of the censure and penalties of the church. The Primate sought to combat the vice of incontinence in the laity by wielding the club of penalization over the heads of all offenders, ordering[104] the Bishop of St. Asaph's to punish those in his diocese who were guilty of this vice by "imposing upon them not that penalty which they choose as their preference, but rather that penalty—be it a financial one or a bodily castigation—which by actual experiment you have found to be the one which they more deeply dread".

Peckham also ordered the Bishop of Llandaff to impose a "salutary penance" upon Sir Roger Mortimer for his illicit intercourse with several women; and the primate adds that, if the report be found true that Sir Roger also imprisoned a chaplain who had upbraided him for his sins, the guilty nobleman is to be excommunicated.[105]

The primate's penances were no mere trifles. Sir Osbert Giffard had abducted two nuns, whereupon Peckham ordered[106] the nobleman to doff his knightly trappings and thus stripped to shirt and trunks (*nudus in camisia et femoralibus*) to be flogged three times around the church of Wilton on three solemn days (but not in the presence of the nuns) and three times through the marketplace of Salisbury thrice on a market-day, and three times around the church of Shaftesbury on three solemn days, just as around the church of Wilton, as indicated above. He was then to go in person to the Holy Land as a pilgrim for a period of three years.

Nor were Peckham's penalties reserved only for adults. He was ready to have them inflicted upon mere lads in school. He granted the Master of the school at Canterbury "a special license with power of canonical coertion in order that he might be able to take cognizance of and to exercise jurisdiction freely in the cases

---

104 *Reg.*, p. 739.

105 *Reg.*, p. 497f.

106 *Reg.*, p. 917. Cf. Gasquet, *Parish Life*, p. 231, and Cutts, *op. cit.*, p. 537f.

of his school(s) and scholars".[107] This license states that it merely confirms to the Master the privilege which has been his by custom *ab antiquo,* and was granted under date of March 21, 1291. It seems plain that the Archbishop was deeply concerned with upholding the disciplinary powers of the Master of this school, and his interest in this school (which may have been opposite his own palace) may be traceable to the fact that he himself was the person who appointed the masters.[108] Actual instances occurred when this provision was put into effect, though apparently not during Peckham's own life-time, and can be found at some length in Leach's *Educational Charters.*[109]

Programs of character education hold no brief for idleness, and Peckham strenuously combatted this vice where it existed in Wales. In his opinion, it existed there to an alarming degree and he sought earnestly to remedy what he deemed a dangerous condition. He terms it "otium corporale, quod populum vestrum maculat supra modum, quod quidem est fomentum omnium vitiorum" in his letter to the Bishop of St. Asaph's.[110]

The Primate then continues: "And because there are two aspects of life in the case of persons who are to be saved, namely the active and the contemplative, neither of which is idle, you shall form and mold all of your subjects, both men and women, so that they will try every single day to earn their bread by some kind of work and exercise".

The Archbishop even went so far as to write to the king himself and to ask him to "command that every Welshman, according to his estate should do every day something, so that it may be known how each one gets his living. And I have commanded . . . the sacraments of Holy Church to be refused to the idle, because no one is in a state of salvation who does no profit to the world".[111] Peckham saw clearly the frequent connection between idleness and evil thoughts—"for they are idle, and therefore they think all evil"[112]—and it was to prevent the natural consequences of evil thoughts that the Primate was so strenuous in his urging manual labor as a remedy. In this procedure the Archbishop may well be termed a religious educator.

---

107 See Martin, in *Reg.,* vol. iii, p. xlvii.

108 Leach, *Schools of Medieval England,* pp. 5, 133, 170 and 188f.

109 *Ibid.,* pp. 252-267. The appointment of a Master for the school in Canterbury by Peckham's successor, Winchelsea, April 11, 1306, is given on p. 239.

110 *Reg.,* p. 742.

111 *Reg.* p. 991f. Cf. *ibid.,* p. 776f.

112 *Loc. cit.*

To another prelate, the Bishop of St. David's, the Primate sent a letter[113] of similar purport: "Moreover, since idleness is the mother and nurse of all vices, we beg you for the love of the Lord Jesus Christ, that you will recall, as far as you are able and with all your power, the people of your diocese from idleness, depriving those who remain pertinaciously idle of the sacraments of the church as long as they remain so."[114] He then proceeds to urge some useful occupation every day for everybody. There can be little doubt that this injunction, if followed, would bear some valuable educational fruits.

Among Peckham's restrictive and disciplinary measures mention might be made of his condemnation of certain superstitions which were flourishing in Wales at that time. In his letter to the Bishop of St. Asaph's he alludes to the people being intent upon dreams and fantastic visions,[115] a fact which grieves him very much. He then proceeds to denounce their absorption in the widely prevalent Trojan Myth,[116] urging them to abandon it and to give their attention to the unconquered cross of Christ, in which he invites them henceforth to boast. Any warfare waged against superstition has significance for religious education, and Peckham applied a sound pedagogical principle when he offered them a substitute to put in the place of the belief which he was condemning.

Peckham's Relation to Preceding Legislation and Earlier Treatises

1. Prior Legislation.

Peckham's work was a part of a great stream of legislation, national and international, and it can best be appraised when projected against the background of the similar legislation which was being enacted in his century by the Church in England and at Rome.

In 1215-6 the Fourth Lateran Council had decreed[117] that all

---

113 *Reg.*, pp. 794-7.

114 Elsewhere (*Reg.*, p. 1075; i. e., folio 199.iv) Peckham excommunicates men merely for poaching.

115 *Reg.*, p. 741.

116 This myth, translated into nearly every language and often turned into verse, was diffused throughout western Europe for a thousand years. "For a thousand years the myth of descent from the dispersed heroes of the conquered Trojan race was a sacred literary tradition throughout western Europe . . . . The epic founder of Britain was Brutus . . . of the royal house of Troy. The tradition, repeated in Wace's version of Geoffrey, by Matthew Paris and others, persisted to the time of Shakespeare. Brutus found Albion uninhabited except by a few giants. . . ." A number of versions appeared between 1184 and 1287 and became very popular. (It was in 1284 that Peckham denounced the myth.) There are still three Welsh MS. translations preserved in the British Museum. —*The Encyclopoedia Britannica*, 14th. edition, *s. v.* "Troy", vol. xxii; *sub* "The Mediaeval Legend of Troy", p. 504f.

117 Mansi, t. xxii, col. 1007 and 1010.

the faithful must make their confessions at least once every year.[118] "With the act of confession was usually connected a recitation of the articles which the sponsors were supposed to have impressed upon their god-children. The system further led to an enlargement of the scope of regular instruction. As the Creed and the Lord's Prayer hardly formed a suitable basis for the confession of sins, there originated lists of sins which required ecclesiastical penance; and these with corresponding lists of virtues, were often ordered to be learned by heart."[119]

Many of the decrees of 1215 formed the basis of those promulgated at Oxford[120] in 1222, which in turn were later re-iterated by Peckham. Injunctions similar to Peckham's set of eleven excommunications, his requirements regarding regional confessors,[121] his prohibitions against farming out the revenues of churches without proper licence, his provision for the instruction of the laity as to the proper form of baptism and as to the validity of the English language in the baptismal formula, his strictures against pluralities, his prohibition of the holding of personal property by Religious, his stress upon the seven sacraments, and his provisions for the reverent carrying of the Viaticum to the sick—to mention only such decrees as have been included as possessing relevance to religious education—had all been promulgated in 1222 at the Council of Oxford under Langton.[122]

Provisions similar to Peckham's statutes regarding the ornaments of the church and also as to incontinent clerics had been published by William de Bleys, Bishop of Worcester, 1229.[123]

Constitutions prescribing the penalty for incontinence in clerics and also injunctions insisting upon Confirmation had been set forth in 1236 by Edmund Rich, Archbishop of Canterbury, as well as regulations prescribing the light, the bell, the surplice and the

---

118 For a discussion of this decree, see Lea, H. C., *A History of Auricular Confession,* vol. i, pp. 227-50; Philadelphia: 1896.

119 F. Cohrs in *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, s. v.* Catechisms, vol. ii, p. 443.

120 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. i, p. 585f.

121 Note also the even earlier canon (1217) of the Synod of Dublin given in Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. i, p. 548.

122 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. i, p. 585f. Some of Peckham's own phrases seem to go back to those employed at the Fourth Lateran Council, seven years prior to that at Oxford. For example, compare the "si caecus caecum duxerit, ambo in foveam dilabuntur" of 1215 (Mansi, t. xxii, col. 1015) with the opening words of Peckham's decrees, "Ignorantia sacerdotum populum praecipitat in foveam erroris, et . . . caeci" etc. It was a period which was preëminently internationally minded. Cf. Powicke, *Stephen Langton* (Oxford, 1928), p. 151 f.

123 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. i, p. 623f. See also his earlier Constitutions (1219); *ibid.,* p. 570f.

stole to be used whenever the Viaticum was carried to the sick.[124]

What amounts to a tract on the Seven Deadly Sins had already been incorporated into the Constitutions of Alexander Stavenby, Bishop of Coventry, in 1237.[125]

Otho at the Council of London[126] in 1237 had likewise emphasized the seven sacraments, "de quorum quolibet in sacris canonibus diffusius est tractatum",[127] and had directed the archdeacons to teach all ignorant priests in their jurisdictions. Probably this Council also furnished Peckham with much of the material for his decrees respecting residence and the wearing of clerical garb.

Many of the decrees of the Council of London were re-iterated by Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, in his famous Constitutions published about 1238.[128] These were "directed to the rectors of churches, vicars (and) parochial priests of this diocese",[129] and prescribed the "decalogum . . . septem criminalia . . . septem sacramenta . . . simplicem fidei intellectum, sicut continetur in symbolo, tam majore quam minore, et in tractatu qui dicitur *Quicunque vult*",[130] and also contained the specific direction, "Provideant etiam attentius ecclesiarum rectores et sacerdotes parochiales, ut pueri parochiarum suarum diligenter doceantur et sciant orationem Dominicam, et symbolum, et salutationem beatae Virginis, et crucis signaculo se recte consignare".[131] These constitutions treat also of many other matters which Peckham dealt with later, often in almost the very same words.[132]

Walter Cantilupe, Bishop of Worcester, in 1240 had anticipated Peckham's requirement that the bell should be rung at the elevation of the Host,[133] and had also required the teaching of the Ten Commandments, the Seven Deadly Sins, the seven sacraments, and the creed.[134]

---

124 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. i, p. 635f. Cf. Gasquet's statement that "Peckham legislated for the mode of carrying the Blessed Sacrament to the sick, or rather he codified and made obligatory the usual practise"—*Parish Life,* p. 203f.

125 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. i, p. 640f.

126 *Ibid.,* p. 647f.

127 *Ibid.,* p. 650.

128 See his *Epistolae* (H. R. Luard, editor) in the Rolls Series, p. xxxix.

129 *Ibid.,* p. 154.

130 *Ibid.,* p. 155.

131 *Ibid.,* p. 156. Cf. also J. Collier, *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain* (London, 1852), vol. ii, p. 511f.; G. C. Perry, *Life and Times of Robert Grosseteste* (London, 1871), pp. 16 and 115f.; *The Lay Folks' Catechism, E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 118, p. xxxv; &c.

132 See also his letter to the clergy, *ibid.,* p. 439f., in which he bids them "vigilate circa vos et circa gregem ovium vestrarum."

133 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. i, p. 667.

134 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. i, p. 669.

In 1246, Richard de la Wich, Bishop of Chichester, had required the priest to teach the laity the *Pater Noster,* the creed, and the salutation of the blessed Virgin "in lingua materna diligenter et frequenter".[135]

Many of these ordinances had been repeated by various other councils[136] during the years just preceding Peckham's primacy. Special mention should be made here of the *Statuta synodalia* of the diocese of Norwich,[137] promulgated about 1257, and of the decres of the Legatine Council[138] presided over by Ottobon in 1268. The *Statuta synodalia* included the following matters which Peckham later incorporated either into his Lambeth Constitutions or into his epistles and less formal injunctions:—

> The Ten Commandments, Seven Deadly Sins, baptismal formula, creed and reverence to the elevated host to be taught to the people;
> The Reserved Sacrament to be kept with care and honor;
> The Viaticum to be carried with reverence, light, bell, etc.;
> Services not to be abbreviated: "divinum officium integre fiat devote . . . ne pro hostia viva et integra offeratur hostia mutilata et mortua";
>
> Continence to be kept by the clergy;
> Benefices not to be farmed out;
> Games of dice not to be indulged in;
> Clerical habit to be worn;
> Pluralities to be relinquished;
> Residence in benefices to be required;
> Buying and selling in churches to be stopped;
> Churches to have a sufficient supply of ornaments, vessels, and vases;
> Bodies of the dead to be respected, and cemeteries to be fenced in.

These statutes seem almost to go beyond what Peckham later required, for they contain explicit provision for the special instruction of children in the Lord's prayer, the creed, and the salutation of the blessed Virgin, as well as in the proper way in which to make the sign of the cross,[139] and also the instruction of adults when they come to make their confessions, together with the distinct and public recitation of the Lord's prayer and the creed "singulis diebus ad Primam et ad Completorium".

The decrees of the Legatine Council presided over by Ottobon in 1268 offer such striking parallels with the later legislation

---

135 *Ibid.,* p. 693; "et otiosis fabulis non intendant."

136 E. g., by Aegidius, Bishop of Salisbury, in 1256 (*ibid.,* p. 713) and by Boniface, Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1261 (*ibid.,* p. 746f.) when he also dealt with the subject of the "Right of sancutary."

137 *Ibid.,* p. 731f.

138 *Ibid.,* vol. ii, pp. 1-19.

139 *Loc. cit.,* p. 732.

and writings of Peckham that it has seemed worthwhile to list some of the most outstanding similarities[140] in the following tabular form:—

REGULATION	OTTOBON (1268) in *Concilia, ii,*	PECKHAM (1279-) in *Concilia, ii,*
Easter and Whitsuntide baptisms	p. 2	p. 53
Clerical garb to be worn	p. 4	p. 59
No concubines to be permitted	p. 5	p. 36
Residence to be required	p. 5	(*Reg.,* passim)
Rights of sanctuary	p. 8	p. 57
Buildings to be kept in repair	p. 9	(*Reg.,* p. 950)
Against farming out revenues	p. 10	(*Reg.,* p. 950) p. 58
No trading in church edifices	p. 14	(*Reg.,* p. 654)
Religious to own nothing	p. 16	(*Reg.,* p. 342)
Priors to tend their sick	p. 17	(*Reg.,* p. 648)
Full accounting to be made	p. 17	(*Reg.,* passim)

Peckham himself refers[141] to his desire to "cling to the footprints of the holy fathers" and specifically mentions the Lateran Council (1215), the London Council (1222), the Lambeth Council (1261), and Ottobon's Council (1268). This last Council Peckham quoted frequently in his letters, e. g., *Reg.,* pp. 738, 795, 848 and *passim.*

From these very numerous parallels it seems clear that Peckham was drawing heavily upon existing ecclesiastical legislation. It is to be remembered that these parallels have been limited to those injunctions which were deemed relevant to religious education. An examination of the documents in Wilkins' *Councilia* reveals equally striking similarities in the injunctions unrelated to religious education, and the *Concilia* itself is only a selection of documents.

If, therefore, the parallels are so striking in these incomplete collections of data, it seems clear beyond a doubt that Peckham drew too heavily upon previous sources to be regarded as an innovator or an originator, save possibly in the one instance of his requirement which prescribed with perhaps unprecedented definiteness that the religious instruction intended for the laity was to be given once a quarter. Even here there was a precedent for Peckham to follow, *viz.,* the requirement of a quarterly reading of the sentences of excommunication, later called the "Great Sentence" or the "Generalle Sentence".

---

140 Only matters relative to religious education are listed here.

141 In the preamble to the Lambeth Constitutions—Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 51. Cf. also his preamble to the Reading Constitutions, *ibid.,* p. 33.

The fact that this study has cited no canons earlier than those of 1215 does not imply that these canons cannot be traced to earlier councils, for the substance of many of these canons antedates even the Norman conquest. The Council of Clovesho[142] in 747 promulgated several canons similar to Peckham's. The "Canons of Edgar"[143] *c.* 970, required the priests to preach every Sunday, and *inter alias* dealt with reverent conduct of the services, clerical habit, purgation, the Viaticum, &c. Canons of Elfric[144] *c.* 990,[145] required the parish priest on every Sunday and holy day to explain to the people in English the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Gospel for the day. The object of citing only councils subsequent to 1215 has been—not an attempt to trace the historical development of canons, a study pertinent to the history of canon law, but not to this present study—an attempt to show what ecclesiastical legislation was current in Peckham's time.[146]

"One explanation of the frequent repetition of these canons by successive synods is that in those early days it was not a matter of course that a law once made stood good until repealed; rather, on the contrary, that a law lapsed by desuetude,[147] and needed to be re-enacted from time to time keep it in vigour. The early kings renewed their predecessors' concessions; grantees sought the confirmation of charters from the heir of the original grantor; and laws of Parliament were often passed again by subsequent Parliaments. So a new archbishop began his reign by calling the provincial synod together and issuing a set of provincial constitutions, repeating former canons, which it was still necessary to keep in active use".[148]

In noting this expansion of the area of catechetical instruction, certain questions naturally arise. Why did it come to seem necessary, in the mind of the Church, to emphasize the Ten Commandments and to expand the range of the traditional simple instruc-

---

142 Cutts, *Parish Priests and their People,* p. 60f.

143 *Ibid.,* p. 66f. and p. 214, footnote.

144 *Ibid.,* p. 74f. Cf. also "Right of sanctuary," p. 75f., and the religious observance of Sunday, p. 79f.

145 Or *c.* 1030. See *ibid.,* p. 214, where it seems to state that the Ten Commandments and the (eight) Deadly Sins were made a part of the instruction to be given to the people. Cutts considers this to have been the first of the long series of synodal instructions.

146 For *continental* efforts toward education subsequent to the decrees of 1215, see the constitutions cited by A. G. Little in his *Studies in English Franciscan History,* p. 159, note 3.

147 Cf. "Ordinationem igitur praedictam a dissuetudine revocantes" in Article viii of the Lambeth Constitutions—Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 54.

148 Cutts, *op. cit.,* p. 267, note.

tion? Why did the seven deadly sins and the seven cardinal virtues now receive increased backing from the Church at large?

The first of these questions probably finds its answer in the need felt by the Church for a tightening of its ethical demands upon its members and for an increasing strictness in its discipline. This general need found expression in the requirement of the Fourth Lateran Council, 1215, that all the faithful were to go to confession at least once each year.[149] This requirement in turn produced a desire for a detailed outline to be followed in the confessional, especially in the case of the less educated. Such an outline was furnished by combining the Ten Commandments with the two lists of sevens, and this outline came to be incorporated into catechetical formulas.[150] This movement was re-enforced from two quite opposite directions, *viz.*, the writings of the Scholastics, and the emphasis upon ethical and non-ceremonial matters characteristic of certain pre-reformation sects.

From the first direction came a definite impetus from the Scholastics. "Den Anstoss zu seiner[151] Einbürgerung unter die katechetischen Lehrstücke geben die Scholastiker, und seit dem vierzehnten Jahrhundert wird er mit grosser Liebe, ja sogar als das vornehmste Stück des Katechismus behandelt".[152] Peckham stood mid-way in this stream, laboring—as he did—toward the end of the thirteenth century.

From the second direction came the emphasis upon instruction along ethical lines characteristic of such pre-reformation[153] sects as the Waldensians. "So finden wir schon im 12. Jahrhundert bei den Waldensern, in den Thälern zwischen Piemont und Frankreich die Katechese gepflegt. Ihr Katechismus (las interrogacions menors) enthält den Dekalog, das Symbolum, das Vater Unser, und nimmt schon Bezug auch auf die Lehre von den Sacramenten. Er schliesst sich an die drei Cardinaltugenden (Glaube, Liebe, Hoffnung) an und ist in Fragen und Antworten gehalten: ein recht rühmenswerthes Werk".[154]

The second of these questions, *viz.*, why did the seven deadly sins and the seven cardinal virtues now receive increased backing from the Church, is capable of a fairly definite answer. Peter Lom-

---

149 Mansi, t. xxii, col. 1007 and 1010.

150 See Harnack, Theodosius, *Katechetik* (Erlangen, 1882): "Diese Beichtstücke werden die Hauptstücke des Katechismus", p. 58.

151 *Viz.*, the decalogue.

152 Harnack, *op. cit.*, p. 60. Cf. also pp. 63-4. He gives a brief historical sketch on pp. 59f.

153 *Ibid.*, p. 61.

154 *Ibid.*, p. 62.

bard (d.1160?) had expressed them in their final form; Hugh of St. Victor (d.1141) had given a definition of each; Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura had definitely incorporated the list into the accepted theology of the mediaeval church; and others, e. g., Alexander of Hales and Vincent of Beauvais, had discussed them.[155]

Messenger is probably correct in saying that "the teaching value of the symbolic number was too great to permit its disuse in favor of other systems especially when the weight of theological influence lay behind it".[156] It was reflected not only in the works of theologians and preachers, but also in "didactic poetry, popular tales, lives of the saints, the drama and artistic representation".[157]

As a result of the decree of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 requiring a confession at least once a year on the part of all the faithful, *Summae Confessorum* (for the guidance of the confessor in questions relating to the deadly sins) became numerous in the thirteenth century.[158] Berthold of Regensburg (1210-1272) frequently utilized the seven deadly sins in his sermons.[159] When it is recalled that he was an influential Franciscan of Peckham's own century, it cannot be surprising if he exerted some influence upon his English brother; and it is probable that Peckham himself wrote on the subject of confession.[160]

2. Peckham's Relation to Earlier Treatises

It would not be difficult to regard Peckham's Lambeth degrees on education as a Tract or manual for the clergy. Viewed in this light, they seem to have been a link in a chain reaching back (by way of literary inter-relationships) to Peraldus, St. Edmund Rich, and Grosseteste—perhaps including (St.) Bonaventura.[161]

This last conjecture is not entirely without foundation, for both Peckham and Bonaventura were at the University of Paris at the same time,[162] and it is possible that Peckham may have seen Bonaventura's work and been influenced by it.

---

155 Cf. Messenger, R. E., *Ethical Teachings in the Latin Hymns of Medieval England with Special Reference to the Seven Deadly Sins and the Seven Principal Virtues* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1930), p. 167f. References to sources are given on p. 168, note 4.

156 *Ibid.*, p. 175.

157 *Loc. cit.*

158 See instances cited by Messenger, *ibid.*, p. 169.

159 *Op. cit.*, p. 173f.

160 MS. Phillipps 3119, folios 88v and 89, which might repay investigation.

161 Several works, formerly attributed to Bonaventura, are now regarded as works by Peckham. See Livarius Oliger, O. F. M., in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, vol. iv (1911); and Fr. F. M. Delorme in the preface to his *Meditatio Pauperis in Solitudine* (Quaracchi, 1929).

162 *Reg.*, vol. i, p. lvii.

As to St. Edmund Rich, his manual of instruction commonly known as the *Speculum Sancti Edmundi* had vast and now confused and obscure ramifications. "The tradition of the *Speculum* or *Mirrour* goes on and expands, as indeed every mediaeval student knows to his cost, who has ever had to do with them".[163] The same may be said, to a certain extent, of Grosseteste's work, for his *Chasteau d'Amour* was widely read and he may have composed a Latin work which was the original from which the *Prick of Conscience* descended.[164] In any case, his work was early enough to have had some influence upon Peckham, the *Chasteau d'Amour* having appeared about 1236.

It is not improbable that the chain can be traced even further back. Morris believes that the real source of the *Ayenbite of Inwyt* may have been *Sawles Warde,* written perhaps by the author of *Ancren Riwle* about 1230.[165] When it is recalled that the matter contained in all these manuals (both before and after Peckham) was the common heritage of all Christendom and had been so for centuries, it is evident that he would indeed be a rash critic who would venture to place definite bounds to the relationships of these various works. The Creed, Ten Commandments, the Virtues and Vices, the *Pater Noster,* &c., were the themes which all writers of tracts would naturally incorporate into their instruction. It is therefore in the nature of the case quite impossible in many instances to say, at this late date, that one particular writer definitely borrowed or did not borrow from another. Perry[166] even goes so far as to relate *Dan Gaytrige's Sermon* to Grosseteste instead of to Thoresby! He believes that this work is to be found in its original form in a Thornton MS. at the Lincoln Cathedral Library, and that it is not the same as the English translation of Thoresby's constitutions found in Thoresby's *Registrum* at York. It is equally impossible to determine the exact date of the commencement of this stream of religious literature. *Sawles Warde* would seem to be the earliest in date of all the works hitherto cited, but "this piece is a rendering, with considerable variations, additions, and elaborations, of Hugo de St. Victor's *De Anima et Ejus ad Sui et ad*

---

163 Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England,* pp. 288-289.

164 Deanesly, *The Lollard Bible* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1920), p. 214.

165 *Old English Homilies,* edited by Richard Morris (being *E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 34), p. ix. But see Wells, *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1916), p. 345f., and the First Supplement, p. 967.

166 See *E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 26, p. (v.); but see Wells, *op. cit.,* First Supplement, pp. 967 and 970.

Dei Cognitionem et ad Veram Pietatem Institutione Libri Quatuor, Book 4, Chapters 13-15."[167]

The impossibility of setting definite bounds to the inter-relations of these various works may be easily seen by noting the fact that Wells[168] lists by name some 79 MSS containing these various themes either in groups or separately. The *Handlyng Synne* is similar to Chaucer's *Parson's Tale,* which is an adaptation of a *summa* of Vices and Virtues, possibly from an untraced version of Guilelmus Peraldus' *Summa seu Tractatus de Viciis.*[169]

* * * *

Peckham's educational work as archbishop probably ended about 1290. Even before that year the entries in his *Registrum* become infrequent, suggesting the possibility that the Primate had become a sick man. Finally, in 1292, the Chronicler[170] declares: "Luna[171] patiebatur eclipsim: archiepiscopus namque Cantuariae cujus sapientia ante obitum suum fuerat totaliter devorata, qui in prosperitate sua multos objecerat et contempsit, et maxime professores ordinis beatissimi Benedicti, sine planctu monachorum in hoc anno obiit".

Yet it is odd that the very letter[172] describing his last illness alludes to the fact that there was a rumor abroad to the effect that Rome was about to confer upon Peckham one of its highest honors: "Creditur a nonnullis quod nominatus sit ad cardinalatum vel in proximis ordinibus nominetur". But the end came in December 1292, probably on the eighth,[173] and on the nineteenth the archbishop was buried in the north cross aisle of the cathedral at Canterbury, near the spot where his predecessor Becket had been murdered.[174]

---

167 Wells, *op. cit.,* p. 273. For the literary antecedents of the *Ancren Riwle,* see the full critical apparatus given by Wells, *op. cit.,* pp. 361-365 and 820, and the Supplements.

168 *Op. cit.,* pp. 350-355, 471f., 530. The Supplements of 1919, 1923, and 1926 contain references to additional MSS. of a similar nature.

169 See Wells, *op. cit.,* pp. 343, 346, and 745.

170 In *Flores Historiarum* (edition of 1570), p. 386.

171 The Pope was, of course, the sun.

172 Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Various Collections,* 1901: Report on the Muniments of the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury, p. 276.

173 Martin, *Reg.,* vol. iii, p. liii.

174 Martin, *loc. cit.*

PECKHAM'S INFLUENCE

Note on Chapters V-VII

We are not concerned here with the widely divergent and frequently contradictory estimates of Peckham as a man—varying from profound veneration of him as a model of humility and learning,[1] on the one hand, to scathing denunciation of him as a ludicrous and contemptible person, *gestus affatusque pompatici,*[2] claiming the prerogatives of his office, a mere puppet of the pope, wholly anti-English in his outlook,[3] and a vigorous satellite of anti-Christ,[4] on the other hand.[5] The three following chapters present a collection of historical data (constitutions, injunctions, mandates, visitation articles, manuals for the clergy, and sermon-collections) hitherto never brought together and treated from this point of view, *viz.,* as exhibiting Peckham's influence and thus providing a new basis for an appraisal of his importance as a religious educator.

---

1 Coulton considers Peckham a saintly man, (*From St. Francis to Dante* [London, 1906], p. 294), and describes him as "a prelate of strict, almost inconvenient, purity of life and zeal for discipline," *Five Centuries of Religion,* vol. ii, p. 339.

2 Trivet, *Annales* (London, 1845), p. 300. For other opinions of Peckham as a man, see Hook, *loc. cit., passim.*

3 Cf. Prynne, *op. cit.,* p. 253: "this papal, perfidious Archbishop."

4 *Ibid.,* p. 264.

5 For a recent (1925) re-evaluation of the Primate as an executive, see Hilda Johnstone, "Pecham and the Council of Lambeth of 1821," in *Essays in Medieval History presented to Thomas Frederick Tout.*

V

UPON ECCLESIASTICAL LEGISLATION

Scarcely six years[6] had elapsed before evidences of the influence of Peckham's Lambeth Constitutions begin to appear. In 1287, Peter Quivil[7] held a synod at Exeter[8] which put forth fifty-five decrees, many of them dealing with the same matters set forth in the Lambeth Constitutions, e. g., the sacraments of the church baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, unction, orders; concubines of the clergy, residence, and the same eleven groups of offences which are to be punished by excommunication.

Quivil had been consecrated[9] at Canterbury in 1280, and therefore had probably been present at the Council of Lambeth in 1281.[10] Peckham had been in frequent communication with Bishop Quivil during the ensuing years,[11] and hence it is not unreasonable to assume that the Synod of Exeter would naturally reflect to some extent the wishes of the Archbishop, especially as the diocese of Exeter was an integral part of the archbishop's province.

From this point of view, both the wording and the contents of the twentieth decree of the Synod of Exeter are of particular importance. In this decree, "De inquisitione facienda super literatura ecclesiasticarum personarum",[12] there occur a striking number of the same words previously employed by Peckham in his Lambeth Constitutions, e. g., ignorantia . . . populo . . . caecitatis . . . in foveam . . . decalogum . . . plebi . . . exponat . . . septem peccata mortalia . . . septem sacramenta ecclesiastica . . . articulorum fidei . . . &c.

That these words and the context in which they occur actually indicate Peckham's influence is to be seen from the concluding paragraph of the decree:—"Ut autem, quilibet sacerdos, cui animarum cura incumbit, melius sciat et intelligat, qualiter debeat in ipsa versari; praecipimus, quod quilibet, cui parochialis ecclesiae regimen

---

6 The Council of Lambeth, October, 1281; the Synod of Exeter, April, 1287.

7 Or Quevil; or Wyvil.

8 Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. ii, pp. 129-68.

9 See Stubbs, *Registrum sacrum anglicanum* (second edition, Oxford, 1897), p. 66.

10 See *Reg.*, p. 211f for an order to the Bishop of London to cite all the bishops and suffragans to the Lambeth Council.

11 See Peckham's letters to Quivil in *Reg.*, pp. 269, 304, 311, 364, 378, 406, 407, 409, 583, 790.

12 Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. ii, pp. 143-4.

incumbit, quandam summulam plurimum utilem, immo verius necessariam a diversis tractatibus extractam sub compendio (quae summula sub eisdem verbis incipit, quibus et praesens synodus) citra festum Sti. Michaelis habeat scriptam, et ipsam sane intelligat, ac ea utatur sub poena unius marcae, loci archdiacono applicandae". This "very useful, nay rather, necessary summary, extracted and abridged from various tracts" begins with the same words with which the Synod of Exeter opened, viz., "Altissimus de terra creavit medicinam".[13] The first Lambeth Constitution (following the preamble) opens with the words, "Altissimus de terra assumpti corporis creavit humani generis medicinam".[14] Therefore this "useful, necessary, abridged summary" presumably consists of the Lambeth Decrees.

It is to be noted further that every priest having the cure of souls is to have this summary written before a definite date, the feast of St. Michael; that he is to understand it very thoroughly; and that he is to use it, under penalty of a fine. The fine is to be paid to the archdeacon of that locality. In order to give teeth to this requirement, Quivil decreed that, if the archdeacon should remit the payment of this fine to the offending clergyman, or decrease the amount of the fine, or fail to collect it, the archdeacon himself would be held responsible for double the amount, to go towards the fabric fund of the church at Exeter.[15]

It is interesting to note how highly these Exeter constitutions of 1287 are regarded by Professor Coulton. He states that they "not only summarise the most important points of English Church law, but also add very valuable illustrative comments. These detailed instructions, dealing simply with the pressing needs of the moment, and in no way concerned with a distant posterity, throw, perhaps more light upon mediaeval parish life than any other document of equal length".[16]

In 1301, Archbishop Winchelsey, Peckham's successor, undertook a metropolitical visitation of the diocese of Worcester. The

---

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 130.

[14] Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. ii, p. 52. Lyndwood comments quite fully upon this passage in his *Provinciale*, p. 8f.

[15] Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. ii, p. 144. That the *summula* was the appended Exeter MS. printed by Wilkins on pp. 162-8 seems quite improbable, because (1) the MS. is "only possibly coeval with (*forte coaevo*)" the decrees of the synod; and (2) it seems highly improbable that the synod would have prescribed so impressively a tract written by "a single unskilled person plainly ignorant of the Latin language." See *ibid.*, p. 129 and "Nota."

[16] *Medieval Studies, No.* 8, p. 1, being a reprint from *The Contemporary Review* of June and July, 1907. See also its "Appendix," titled "Parish Life in Medieval England," pp. 9-11. This "Appendix" is reprinted from *The Churchman* of April, 1907.

visitation articles[17] which were prepared by Winchelsey for this occasion have never been printed, but they are to be found on folios 61-5 of MS. Cotton Galba, E. iv.[18] They were based mainly on the constitutions of Otho and Ottobon, and they "refer also to some of the provincial constitutions of the Archbishops, notably those of Peckham".[19] At least, this is the conviction of Miss Graham, a conviction which she has been kind enough to repeat in some correspondence with the present writer. She writes: "Archbishop Winchelsey had in his mind Archbishop Peckham's provincial constitutions when for instance he formed those two articles:—

> 'Item an alicui commiserit custodiam alicujus ecclesie preter juris titulo,[20] videlicet institutionis vel commende.
>
> 'Item an jure devoluto ecclesiam vel beneficium ecclesiasticum contulerit postquam per annum vacaverit . . . etc.' "

There does not, however, appear to be any documentary[21] evidence to substantiate Miss Graham's observation.

In 1308, Henry Woodloke, Bishop of Winchester, issued a set of "similar injunctions",[22] but these contain no reference to Peckham's Lambeth decrees, unless "(Oxoniensi et) Londinensi consiliis"[23] be meant to include Lambeth, or unless "sanctorum patrum salubribus institutis"[24] be held to include John Peckham. But Bishop Woodloke deals with nearly everything which Peckham had dealt with at Lambeth, although in these injunctions of 1308 there is nothing corresponding to the instructional tract issued at Lambeth.

In 1312, Richard Kellow, Bishop of Durham, writes "quasdam constitutiones salubres edidimus, quas una cum domini Octoboni . . . et diversorum praedecessorum nostrorum constitutionibus[25] . . . in praesenti sacra synodo duximus publicandas".[26] He

---

17 For a discussion of visitation articles, see Cutts, *op. cit.,* Chapter XVIII: "Visitation Articles and Returns;" also p. 337.

18 Photostatic reproductions of these folios were secured for this study.

19 Graham, *English Ecclesiastical Studies* (London: S. P. C. K.; New York & Toronto: The Macmillan Co., 1929), p. 333.

20 The original reads *titulos.*

21 The folios themselves do not contain Peckham's name, and Miss Graham has cited no documentary evidence occurring elsewhere which would establish with certainty the dependence of Winchelsey upon Peckham in these visitation articles.

22 Coulton, *Medieval Studies No.* 8: Appendix, p. 15. (Second Series.)

23 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, pp. 293-301.

24 *Loc. cit.*

25 Constitutions which (he adds) "per labentis protractionem temporis, a memoriis hominum, quae labiles existunt, fere post tempus ultimae publicationis earundem in nostris civitatibus et dioecesibus jam sublatis, et proh dolor! alienis."

26 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 416f.

then continues: "Licet in canonibus, ac legatorum et praedecessorum nostrorum constitutionibus fuerit diffinitum, qualiter viri ecclesiastici in instruendo plebem sibi commissam . . . se gerere debeant et habere; . . . monemus omnes et singulos viros ecclesiasticos, quod juxta canonum et constitutionum tenorem . . . plebem instruant solicite et informent verbo pariter et exemplo". Peckham's influence cannot be proved from these words, but it nevertheless is quite possible that Peckham's constitutions should be included in those which Kellow had in mind.

In the Register[27] of John Grandisson, Bishop of Exeter, under date of May 30, 1335, occurs a "Mandatum pro delacione Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in tota Diocesi" which possesses striking resemblances to the similar decree of Peckham titled "De eucharsitiae custodia" and beginning with the words, "Dignissimum eucharistiae sacramentum praecipimus".[28] It also shows remarkable similarities to the corresponding Lambeth Constitution.[29] In order to exhibit these resemblances and similarities, part of Grandisson's mandate is here reproduced, capitals being employed for those words which occur in the decrees of both prelates.

"COTIDIANIS SCANDALIS EXPERIMUR . . . SUPERPELLICUM . . . INDUERE, LUMEN ET TINTINABULUM ante se facere deportari negligenter omittunt; ac . . . IRREVERENTER SE EXHIBENT SUPRA MODUM, quod SALUTIS Amator, QUI INFINITO AMORE SE DEDIT IN VIATICUM ECCLESIAE, PRO TANTE IRREVERENCIE INJURIA merito OFFENDATUR; Constituciones Provinciales . . . transgrediendo . . . ; precedente, quoque, tintinnabulo, ex cujus sonitu EXCITENTUR . . . ."

It may indeed be conceded that this does not constitute a demonstration of borrowing on the part of Grandisson; but even if he were not actually quoting from Peckham, it is plain that he is emphasizing the same details and employing some of the same expressions which Peckham incorporated into his own decrees.

Gasquet feels certain[30] that the Constitutions of Peckham were referred to in the diocesan order[31] put forth by the Synod of Sodor presided over by Bishop Russell in 1350. The injunction runs as follows:—

"All rectors, vicars, or chaplains holding ecclesiastical offices

---

27 Edited by F. C. Hingeston-Randolph (London, 1894-9), vol. ii, p. 786f.

28 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 48.

29 *Ibid.,* p. 52.

30 *Old English Bible* (London, 1897), p. 188.

31 See Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. iii, p. 11.

shall expound clearly and plainly to their people, on all Sundays and feast-days the Word of God and the Catholic faith of the Apostles; and they shall diligently instruct their subjects in the articles of Faith, and teach them in their native language the Apostles' Creed, and urge them to expound and teach the same to their children".[32]

The present writer acknowledges that Peckham's influence may indeed have been felt in the synod, but fails to see that the decree itself warrants more than a conjecture as to the presence of this influence in this particular decree.

In 1357, John de Thoresby, Archbishop of York, put forth a mandate "evidently suggested by the action of Peckham, seventy-six years before. Following the example of the Southern Archbishop at the Council of Lambeth, Thoresby gained for his catechism the approval of the Council or Convocation of York. Both primates doubtless knew that their action would come with added authority from the whole church of each province; and also that by thus taking their clergy into confidence, they would ensure their sympathy and co-operation. How closely the Catechism, in its original Latin form, was framed on Peckham's model, our readers may easily see by comparing the two texts (C.) and (P.). The exordium upon the carelessness and ignorance of the clergy, and the Archbishop's hope of reformation with the approval and assistance of his sacred Council, though more gently worded than that of the earlier *Constitutions,* is to the same effect. So is the ordinance which follows: the clergy are simply to expound the Creed, the Commandments, and the same additional 'fundamentals' of faith and practice: and to remove the excuse of ignorance, a similar brief and clear explanation is given".[33]

This close correspondence, both in substance and in phraseology, may be illustrated by a quotation from each, *viz.*:

Peckham	Thoresby
Et ne quis a praedictis per ignorantiam se excuset, quae tamen omnes ministri Ecclesiae scire tenentur, ea perstringimus summaria brevitate ll. 23-25.	Et ne quis super hiis per ignorantiam se valeat excusare, haec sub verbis planis et incultis, ut sic levius in publicam deducantur notitiam, fecimus annotare. ll. 26-28.

Thoresby enjoined upon his clergy more frequent instruction than had Peckham—"at least on the Lord's Day" takes the place

---

[32] Cf. Gasquet, *loc. cit.*

[33] See *The Lay Folks' Catechism, E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 118, pp. xv-xvi.

of the "four times a year, on one or more holy-days" in Peckham's canons of Lambeth.

But a further indication of the dependence of Thoresby's work upon Peckham's is found in the fact that the English version is in one respect closer to Peckham's Constitutions than to the original Latin of Thoresby himself, *viz.,* the English translator, in treating of the Seven Deadly Sins, follows the order of Peckham's work instead of that of the authorized Latin version of the York Convocation, putting Gluttony fourth and Sloth sixth instead of the reverse.

Nolloth argues at some length[34] the possibility of Thoresby's Catechism having been cast into dramatic form and of having been presented in the shape of miracle-plays. If this conjecture should be a sound one, Peckham's influence became very far-reaching indeed.

So patent is Peckham's influence upon Thoresby that it is unchallenged by any historian known to the writer.[35] Owst refers[36] to Thoresby's *Catechism* as "his edition of the Peckham Constitutions" and says that Thoresby merely "re-stated" them,[37] and terms the *Catechism* "the Peckham-Thoresby outlines of Faith",[38] adding that "in one form or another this programme remains the backbone of every subsequent treatise".[39] Neither Wilkins nor Mansi appears to have printed the particular Constitutions which contain the mandate and tract; but the editors of *The Lay Folks' Catechism* profess[40] to have reproduced the text as found in the Archbishop's official register.

Simon Langham, Bishop of Ely, at the synod of 1364, promulgated an act[41] in which the clergy were required to expound the Decalogue, the Seven Deadly Sins, the Seven Sacraments, an instruction on confession, the proper form for baptizing a person,

---

34 *Op. cit.,* pp. xvii-xx.

35 *Ibid.,* pp. ix and xv.

36 *Op. cit.,* p. 53.

37 *Op. cit.,* p. 282.

38 *Ibid.,* p. 296.

39 *Ibid.,* p. 282, note 1.

40 *E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 118, p. xvii and p. [1].

41 In Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. iii, p. 59: "Exhortamur in Domino firmiter injugentes, ut unusquisque pastor animarum, et quilibet sacerdos parochialis sciat decalogum . . . eademque populo sibi subjecto frequenter praedicet, et exponat. Sciat quoque quae sint septem criminalia peccata, eademque similiter populo praedicet fugienda. Sciat insuper saltem simpliciter septem ecclesiastica sacramenta . . . quae exiguntur ad verae confessionis et poenitentiae sacramentum, formamque baptizandi doceant frequentur (*sic*) in idiomate communi . . . intellectum fidei, sicut continetur in symbolo . . . ."

the Creed, &c. This looks very much like the Lambeth Constitutions and it is quite possible that this act reflects Peckham's influence in molding the general shape of the materials of religious instruction. The resemblances, even in the diction, are very striking.

William of Wykeham, "the millionaire of his age",[42] while Bishop of Winchester, the richest see in England, has provided us in his *Registrum*[43] with an unusually valuable indication of the influence of the Lambeth constitutions after more than a century had elapsed since their promulgation. It is there recorded that the rector[44] of St. Michael's Church in Jewry Street, Winchester, was compelled to take an oath that he would get by heart within a year the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Seven Works of Mercy, the Seven Mortal Sins, the Sacraments of the church, etc., "prout continetur in constitucione Pecham", under penalty of a fine of 40s. This was on June 24, 1385, more than a hundred years after the Council of Lambeth under Archbishop Peckham. And under date of July 2, 1385, it is recorded that the bishop required "an oath to like effect of John Corbet, rector of Bradley".[45]

Very plain evidence of Peckham's influence is to be seen in the Constitutions of Archbishop Arundel in 1409: "Sacerdotes vero parochiales, sive vicarii temporales . . . in ecclesiis illis, in quibus officia hujusmodi gerunt, illa sola simpliciter praedicent, una cum precibus consuetis, quae in constitutione provinciali a bonae memoriae Johanne, praedecessore nostro, bene et sancte in suppletionem ignorantiae sacerdotum edita, quae incipit, 'Ignorantia sacerdotum', continentur expresse; quam in singulis ecclesiis parochialibus nostrae Cantuariensis provinciae, infra tres menses post publicationem praesentium fieri volumus, et prout postulat, annis et temporibus singulis per ipsos sacerdotes effectualiter declarari".[46] It is to be noticed that Peckham is referred to by name and that

---

[42] Leach, *Schools of Medieval England,* p. 203.

[43] Vol. ii, p. 371, being vol. 13 (1896-9) of the *Hampshire Record Society.*

[44] One Roger Dene.

[45] Cf. also p. 154 of vol. i (*i. e.,* vol. 11 of the *Hamp. Rec. Soc.*). For a trenchant criticism of the editing of this Register, see Gasquet, *England Under the Old Religion,* pp. 339-342. The criticisms do not, however, affect directly the above passages. For a criticism of this "self-righteous article" by Gasquet, who "himself has done far worse" than the editors under criticism, see Coulton, *Medieval Studies No.* 8: *Monastic Schools in the Middle Ages,* Appendix V: Abbot Gasquet's Authority.

[46] Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. iii, p. 315. See also Deanesly, *The Lollard Bible,* p. 295; Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England,* p. 140f; and Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation in England* (London, 1908-13), vol. i, pp. 61f and 545. These constitutions were passed in 1407 but were not published until 1409; see Gairdner, *op. cit.,* p. 62.

the currently accepted title of the relevant portion of his Lambeth Constitutions is also given. Thus the topics of the sermons of parish priests at this time were definitely limited to those enumerated in Peckham's Constitutions of 1281.

On March 20, 1435, John Stafford, Bishop of Bath and Wells, sent out several letters[47] to the dean of Wells, the archdeacons and the guardian of the jurisdiction of Glastonbury, which constitute indisputable proof of the continuance of the influence of Peckham.

These epistolary injunctions dealt with the proper discharge of a priest's pastoral duties (*cure pastoralis,* and *curam animarum*) and in particular his duty as a teacher. After emphasizing the fact that he is following closely in the footsteps of the holy fathers, Stafford gives a list of the material which they deemed the proper body of doctrine to be held and understood by both clergy and laity. In order to exhibit the similarity of Stafford's list with Peckham's, the two are here presented in parallel columns:—

Stafford	Peckham
quatuordecim fidei articulorum	quatuordecim fidei articulos
decem decalogi mandatorum	decem mandata decalogi
duorum preceptorum evangelii	duo praecepta evangelii
gemine scilicet caritatis	scilicet geminae caritatis
septem operum misericordie	septem opera misericordiae
quinque sensuum custodiam	
septem peccata capitalia	septem peccata capitalia
cum sua progenie vitanda	cum sua progenie
septem virtutes principales	septem virtutes principales
septem gratie sacramenta	septem gratiae sacramenta

There are other verbal similarities also:—

Stafford	Peckham
quater in omni anno	quater in anno
ne quis a predictis per	ne quis a praedictis per
ignoranciam se excuset	ignorantiam se excuset
summaris brevitatis	summaria brevitate
cujuslibet curiose subti-	cujuslibet subti-
litatis textura	litatis textura fantastica
in vulgari populo	populo vulgariter
exponenda	exponat

It is quite true that not even these seventeen striking similarities of arrangement and diction are sufficient to establish an incontrovertible demonstration of Peckham's influence upon Staf-

[47] See *The Register of John Stafford,* edited by T. S. Holmes ([London], 1915-6), vol. ii, p. 173f. For editoral comment upon the importance of this decree, see vol. i, pp. xxv and xlv-xlvi.

ford; but that demonstration is given by the statement of Stafford in the words immediately following the word "exponenda" above, *viz.,* "que inter alios constituciones bone memorie Johannis olim Cantuariensis archiepiscopi apud Lambhith editas et in sermone latino promulgatas scribuntur, quas nos ex causa hiis nostris litteris vulgarizari decrevimus . . . . in hec verba;- Ignorantia sacerdotum populum precipitat in foveam erroris . . . ." etc., the continuing words being taken verbatim from Peckham's Constitutions of Lambeth.

Bishop Stafford ordered every curate to expound four times each year this body of religious instruction which he had written out in English in this letter.[48] His earnestness in this matter may be seen from the fact that he imposed a fine of a half-mark upon every curate each and every time that he failed to give the instruction here enjoined, and to insure the archdeacon's giving this matter his attention he alloted half the fine to the archdeacon's own discretionary fund[49] and directed the archdeacon to spend the other half upon the indigent parishioners of the neglectful curate.[50]

In 1466, Archbishop Neville promulgated some lengthy Constitutions for the province of York, re-iterating the requirement of systematic instruction and setting forth in great detail the exact ground to be covered. The remarkable degree to which he exhibits Peckham's influence may be seen, not only from the similarity of the language employed throughout all the constitutions. As a proof of the almost indubitable influence of Peckham, after nearly two hundred years and in a part of England over which he had held no jurisdiction save a vague and honorific one, a section[51] of Neville's Constitutions is here reproduced, capitals indicating those words which are identical in the two sets of constitutions.

> "IGNORANTIUM SACERDOTUM plurimum PRAECIPITAT IN FOVEAM ERRORIS, ET CLERICORUM STULTITIA VEL RUDITAS, QUI diffinitione canonica filios FIDELIUM INSTRUERE JUBENTUR, MAGIS ALIQUANDO AD ERROREM PROFICIT QUAM DOCTRINAM; QUIDAM ENIM CAEteris PRAEDICANTES NON SEMPER LOCA VISITANT, QUAE MAGIS CONSTAnT VERITATIS LUMINE INDIGERE, TESTANTE PROPHETA, 'Quia PARVULI petierunt PANEM,

---

48 Cf. "quater in omni anno in forma pradicta coram parochainis ibidem publicet et exponat publicarique et exponi faciat in vulgari solempniter et intelligibiliter cum effectu" — *The Register of John Stafford,* vol. ii, p. 180.

49 "cujus alteram partem pro vestro arbitrio disponi volumus" — *loc. cit.*

50 "reliquam vero distribui volumus per vos vel officialem vestrum inter pauperes parochianos ejusdem curati taliter negligentis" — *loc. cit.*

51 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. iii, p. 599f. The *summaria* which follow are likewise almost verbatim counterparts of Peckham's corresponding summaries.

et non ERAT, QUI FRANGERET:' ET ALIO CLAMANTE, 'QUIA EGENI ET PAUPERES QUAERUNT AQUAS, LINGUA EORUM siti ARUIT:' IN QUORUM REMEDIUM DISCRIMINUM STATUENDO PRAECIPIMUS, UT QUILIBET SACERDOS PLEBI PRAESIDENS, QUATER IN ANNO, HOC EST, SEMEL IN QUoLIBET QUARTerio ANNI, DIE UNa SOLENNI VEL PLURIBUS, PER SE VEL PER ALIUM EXPONAT POPULO VULGARITER, ABSQUE CUJUSLIBET SUBTILITATIS TEXTURA FANTASTICA, QUATUORDECIM FIDEI ARTICULOS; DECEM MANDATA DECALOGI; DUO PRAECEPTA EVANGELII, SCILICET GEMINAE CHARITATIS; SEPTEM OPERA MISERICORDIAE; SEPTEM PECCATA CAPITALIA CUM SUA PROGENIE; SEPTEM VIRTUTES PRINCIPALES; AC SEPTEM GRATIAE SACRAMENTA. ET NE QUIS A PRAEDICTIS PER IGNORANTIAM SE EXCUSET, QUAE, cum OMNES MINISTRI ECCLESIAE SCIRE TENENTUR, EA PERSTRINGIMUS SUMMMARIA BREVITATE . . . ."

Owst seems to be correct in his assertion that Peckham's warning against the "Ignorantia Sacerdotum" was "repeated again as late as 1518",[52] even though Peckham's own name is not actually mentioned, for the names of Thoresby and Neville are explicitly given,[53] and Peckham's influence upon these two Archbishops of York has been treated in the preceding pages of this study.

To the year 1518 Wilkins assigns the "Constitutiones Eboracensis provinciae a Thoma ibidem archiepiscopo et legato circiter annum Domini M.D.xviii recognitae, et secundum titulos promulgatae", and Wilkins concludes that this Thomas was Cardinal Wolsey.[54] The following excerpts from this sixteenth century collection of constitutions will serve to establish their relation to and their dependence upon, the Lambeth Constitutions of John Peckham.

"I. De summa Trinitate et fide catholica.

GEORGIUS NEVILL

Ignorantia sacerdotum populum praecipitat in foveam erroris, et clericorum stultitia vel ruditas . . . ."[55]

"II. De constitutionibus Johannis Thoresby.

Et ne constitutiones nostrae per non usum seu abusum effectu (quod absit) careant et vigore, praecipimus in nostra provincia Eborum eas futuris temporibus inviolabiliter observari; mandantes co-epsicopis, et suffraganeis nostris, archdiaconisque universis nostrae pro-

---

52 *Op. cit.*, p. 46 and note 5.

53 Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. iii, pp. 662-675.

54 *Ibid.*, p. 662 — footnote.

55 *Ibid.*, p. 662.

vinciae Eborum, ut ipsas nostras constitutiones, vel per se, vel per alios, ut jus exigit, publicent et faciant publicari . . . ."[56]

"GEORGIUS NEVILL

Ignorantia sacerdotum, ut infra. Praecipimus, ut quolibet sacerdos plebi praesidens, quater in an. hoc est semel in qualibet quarta anni, die una solenni vel pluribus, per se vel per alium exponat populo vulgariter, absque cujuslibet subtilitatis textura fantastica, quatuordecim fidei articulas, decem mandata decalogi . . ." and practically the whole "Peckham Outline of Faith" in great detail.[57]

Nor are these the only evidences of the closeness of the relationship between these constitutions of Wolsey and those of Peckham and his imitators. Wolsey here re-iterates at least three of Thoresby's constitutions, *viz.,* those against business being transacted in churches, etc., on Sundays or feast-days,[58] those against the clergy wearing un-clerical garb (*vestes nimia brevitate ridiculosas vel notandas*),[59] and Thoresby's exaltation of the *Pastoralis officii.*[60]

Between the year (1518) when these constitutions were promulgated and the year 1536 occurred the definite break with Rome. After that event, the medieval elements in the "Peckham outline of Faith" disappear from the authoritative formularies of the Church of England, and only the Creed, the *Pater noster,* the Ten commandments, and the two sacraments ordained by Christ continue to appear in official pronouncements on the educational requirements of the Church.[61]

As far as the writer knows, no other important ecclesiastical legislation existed in England which prescribed a definite outline of religious instruction for the laity except that which flows in the

---

[56] *Ibid.,* p. 663.

[57] *Ibid.,* p. 664f.

[58] *Ibid.,* p. 667.

[59] *Ibid.,* p. 670.

[60] *Ibid.,* p. 674f.

[61] Cf. "A short instruction into Christian religion, being a Catechism set forth by Archbishop Cranmer in 1548 together with the same in Latin translated from the German by Justus Jonas." This catechism expounds the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer. The English version fills 214 pages and the Latin version covers 182 pages.

"A short catechism, or playne instruction," in *Liturgies &c. of Edward VI.,* J. Ketley, editor (The Parker Society, 1844), explains the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the two sacraments commanded by Christ, and the Lord's Prayer. It makes only a passing reference in general terms to virtues and vices. The English occupies 30 pages and the Latin fills 26 pages. Cf. Strype, *Memorials of Cranmer* (1848-54), vol. ii, p. 417f; and Dixon, *History of the Church of England* (Oxford, 1878-1902), vol. iii, pp. 516-8. See also Proctor & Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1901), p. 601f.

general channel marked out by the Lambeth decrees and which has been examined in the preceding pages. Whatever portions of this outline were retained in the Church of England after the break with Rome would therefore seem to be in the direct line of descent from Peckham's decrees and thus to continue his influence into the Post-Reformation period.

In the year 1536, a set of injunctions "framed by Cranmer were issued by the authority of Henry VIII. Among them was an attempt to revive the practice of catechizing: the clergy were to take care that children should be taught the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments in their mother-tongue."[62] Not only were the clergy to exhort all parents to teach their own children, but also "the said curatis shal in their sermones deliberatlye and plainlye recite ofte the said 'Pater noster', th' Articles of our faythe, and the Tenne Commandments, one clause or article one daye, and another an other daye, tyll the ole be taught and learned by lytill; and shall deliver the same in wrytinge, or shewe where printed bookes conteyning the same be to be sold, to them that can rede or will desire the same . . . ."[63]

In 1537, John Longland, Bishop of Lincoln, issued injunctions[64] requiring all of his clergy who had the cure of souls to observe more faithfully the existing constitutions dealing with the duty of preaching, and proceded to enjoin "sermone Latino vel vulgari, prout magis expedire videbitur, ad minus quater in anno . . . publice, sane, salubriter, catholice, et discrete praedicetis, annunciatis, et exponatis". This *quater in anno* requirement may indeed have been a reverberation of Peckham's own quarterly requirement, in which case it would not be difficult to believe that Peckham was also in the minds of the authorities who had issued the injunctions of 1536, only a year earlier.

In the year 1547, the first year of Edward VI., a set of injunctions directed that "every holy-day throughout the year, when they (deans, archdeacons, parsons, vicars and other ecclesiastical persons) have no sermon, they shall immediately after the gospel, openly and plainly recite to their parishioners in the pulpit, the *Paternoster,* the *Credo,* and the ten commandments in English, to the intent the people may learn the same by heart: exhorting all parents and householders to teach their children and servants the

---

62 Nolloth, in *E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 118, p. xxxvi.
the King's Vicar-General. See Proctor and Frere, *op. cit.,* pp. 30 and 599.

63 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. iii, p. 814. These Injunctions were issued by Cromwell as the King's Vicar-General. See Procter and Frere, *op. cit.,* pp. 30 and 599.

64 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. iii, p. 829.

same, as they are bound by the law of God, and in conscience to do."[65]

Nolloth continues: "The same injunctions also direct 'That they shall in confessions every Lent, examine every person that cometh to confession to them, whether they can recite the articles of their faith, the *Paternoster* and the ten commandments in English, and hear them say the same particularly; wherein if they be not perfect, they shall declare then, that every Christian person ought to know the said things before they should receive the blessed sacrament of the altar, and monish them to learn the said necessary things more perfectly, or else they ought not to presume to come to God's board without a perfect knowledge, and will to observe the same: and if they do, it is to the great peril of their souls, and also the worldly rebuke that they might incur hereafter by the same".[66]

This injunction is strikingly similar to the requirement laid down in *Dan Gaytrige's Sermon:*—

"And that parsons and vikers and al paroche prestes
"Enquere diligently of thair sugettes, in the lentyn tyme,
"When thai come to shrift, whethir thai kun this sex thinges,
"And if it be funden that thai kun thaim noght,
"That thai enyoygne tham opon his behalue,
"And of payne of penaunce for to kun tham."[67]

The Lollard adaptation contains the same requirement:—

"And that personys vicars and parysch prestys
"a-spye besily of here sugetys in the lentun tyme
"whan they come to schryft yf they know and cunne
these sex thyngys.
"And yf it be found that they cun hem not:
"that they charge hem on godys behalue
"and of peyne of penaunce for to cun hem."[68]

The probability of Peckham's influence upon the injunctions of 1547 is supported by the fact that both *Dan Gaytrige's Sermon* and the Lollard adaptation are probably lineal descendants of the Lambeth Constitutions, and that the Six Things, to which both allude, are the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Sacraments,

---

[65] Nolloth, in *The Lay Folks' Catechism, E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 118, *loc. cit.* Cf. also Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. iv, p. 4. For the inclusion of these items in Peckham's decree, see Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 54.

[66] *The Lay Folks' Catechism, E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 118, pp. xxxvi-xxxvii.

[67] *Ibid.,* p. 22, lines 66-71.

[68] *Ibid.,* p. 23, lines 383-388.

the Works of Mercy, the chief virtues, and the Seven Deadly Sins.[69]

In 1549 (only two years later), the first *Book of Common Prayer* inserted into the Confirmation service a Catechism to be learned by the candidates as a preliminary preparation for the reception of the laying on of the bishop's hands.[70] To the end of the Confirmation service[71] was appended the following rubric: "The Curate of every parish, once in six weeks at the least, upon warning by him given, shall upon some Sunday or Holy Day, half an hour before Evensong, openly in the Church instruct and examine so many children of his parish sent unto him, as the time will serve, and as he shall think convenient, in some part of this Catechism".[72]

In 1559, a set of injunctions promulgated under Elizabeth "reproduced"[73] the first of the injunctions of 1547 given above,[74] thus reinforcing by a definite enactment that emphasis upon religious instruction as embodied in a program which in all probability reflects Peckham's influence and which had so recently been incorporated into the *Book of Common Prayer.*

It is quite true that Peckham's name does not appear in these last five ecclesiastical enactments; but it was a very short interval, only eighteen years, from 1518 (when Peckham's influence is with reasonable certainty demonstrable) to 1536, when a portion of the same legislation is again repeated as that which Peckham himself had promulgated at Lambeth in 1281, and which was re-iterated at frequent intervals for more than two centuries.[75]

If any evidence[76] of this influence—probable but not proven—should ever come to light in connection with the enactment of any

---

[69] *Ibid.,* p. 20f.

[70] It differed but little from the first part of the present Catechism, ending with the explanation of the Lord's Prayer.

[71] *Book of Common Prayer,* edition of 1549, fols. cxix-cxxii.

[72] *Ibid.,* fol. cxxii.

[73] See *The Lay Folks' Catechism, E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 118, p. xxxvi, note 2.

[74] See Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. iv, p. 182 for these injunctions of 1559. Both sets are given together by Gee and Hardy in *Documents Illustrative of English Church History,* p. 417f.

[75] It is also to be noted that this critical period as to Peckham's influence (in the field of ecclesiastical legislation **is practically spanned** (in the field of clerical manuals) by the editions of 1520, 1530, and probably 1532 of the *Exornatorium Curatorum,* a work which thrice acknowledges in explicit terms (see below) Peckham's influence upon it.

[76] Such evidence as a statement in some letter of a member of the committee on revision of the prayer-book, or in some record of the proceedings, or in some other contemporary document relating to the passage of the enactments cited.

one[77] of these five instances occurring between the years 1536 and 1559, then Peckham's influence to the present day would be demonstrable, for the same requirement, *viz.*, the learning of the portions of the Lambeth tract repeated in the Catechism of the *Book of Common Prayer,* has been retained in the Anglican Church without a break down to the present day. Even in the absence of such explicit, documentary evidence,[78] it would seem reasonable to infer that Peckham's influence is not to be denied in the ecclesiastical legislation enacted in the years subsequent to the break with Rome.

---

[77] Because the related nature of these enactments seems demonstrable on other grounds.

[78] Such as supplied, e. g., in Gasquet & Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1890), Chapter XI and Appendix V, and in the extensive collections of the Parker Society publications.

VI

UPON CLERICAL MANUALS, &c.

Deanesly holds that for several hundred years clerical manuals were modeled more or less directly upon Peckham's Constitutions of Lambeth:—

> "Nearly all these manuals of the pre-Wycliffite period, unless they adhered closely to the structure of some tenth or eleventh century Latin tract, were thus constructed on the same plan, and shew quite clearly what was considered the official teaching for the laity. This took the form of a skeleton of theology and the moral virtues and vices. . . . These manuals all dealt with the same points which Peckham, Quivil and Thoresby had included in their official manuals, and which the laity were supposed to know by heart. . . . So general was the acceptance of this primary scheme of instruction for lay people, that when the Lollards tried to issue their own books of instruction, they made use of exactly the same plan."[1]

Owst makes no mention of Quivil and Thoresby, but credits Peckham with being the fountain-head of all these manuals:—

> "Their common characteristics are that, with one exception, they are in Latin, and that amid a wealth of pithy information, the regular Peckham outline of instruction always finds a place to itself."[2]

It is now quite impossible to assign definite dates to all of these manuals; even their authors in some cases remain shrouded in mists of uncertainty. But the manuals themselves are by no means so nebulous. They were handy little directories which included not only outlines of the Faith, but also rules and directions for the whole round of parish duties. Perhaps the oldest of these manuals is the *Oculus Sacerdotis* by William de Pagula (or Page) *c.* 1325. It seems to be the parent of several later works, e. g., the *Pupilla Oculi* by John de Burgh, *c.* 1380,[3] the *Manuale Sacerdotum* by John Miraeus,[4] *c.* 1403, and the *Regimen Animarum*,[5]

---

[1] *The Lollard Bible*, p. 216f.

[2] *Preaching in Medieval England*, p. 296f.

[3] Deanesly terms this "perhaps the most popular of all the fifteenth century manuals"—*op. cit.*, p. 202. See also Owst, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

[4] So Peacock in *Myrc's Instructions for Parish Priests, E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 31, p. vi. Owst, however, believes this Miraeus was Mirk—*op. cit.*, pp. 47, 55, 247 and 297. If this be so, the *Manuale Sacerdotum* and the *Instructions for Parish Priests* come from the same hand.

[5] Its author is unknown. See Owst, *op. cit.*, pp, 1, 4, 23, 105-8 and 297f.

c. 1343, which claims to have made use of the *Oculus Sacerdotis.*[6]

Over some of these manuals Peckham's influence is still capable of demonstration; it doubtlessly extended over many others where it is now impossible to trace it explicitly. For convenience of grouping, these manuals have been divided into the Latin group and the English group, although this classification is only a rough one, since some of the mammals, e. g., the *Speculum Christiani,* are extant in both languages, and some, e. g., the *Flos Florum,* are partly in Latin and partly in English.

Peckham's influence over Latin manuals seems to extend to the following:—

1. The *Pupilla Oculi.* This work was written by John de Burgo (or Burgh) in 1358[7] or perhaps later,[8] and was "perhaps the most popular of all the fifteenth century manuals".[9] Its popularity is clearly attested "by printed editions in the sixteenth century as well as by numerous earlier manuscripts".[10] Pars x not only "gives the 'Peckham' programme",[11] but explicitly refers at its beginning to the summary of the articles of Faith "ut reperi in consti. lamech. pcc. ca. ignorātia sacerdotū".[12] Nolloth refers to this passage as follows:—[13]

> "The rule as given in the *Pupilla Oculi* is, that every priest having cure of souls should once each quarter, on one or more holidays, either by himself or some other, set forth the points of doctrine, as specified in Peckham's *Constitution.*"

A perusal of the *Pupilla Oculi* itself reveals the fact that Peckham's influence was not limited to Pars x. The Lambeth Constitution dealing with the "exorcismi et cathecismi" connected with Baptism is referred to in Part II, Cap.vij. fol.viij^{b}; and in Part III, Cap. ij.B. fol.x^{b} both Peckham and his Lambeth Constitutions are explicitly mentioned:—

---

6 See Owst, *op. cit.,* p. 297.

7 *E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 118, p. 120, where an extended quotation is given from Pars IV.

8 Owst, *op. cit.,* p. 298, seems to suggest a date about 1384.

9 Deanesly, *op. cit.,* p. 202.

10 Owst, *loc. cit.*

11 *Ibid.,* note 4.

12 Edition of 1510, folio cxxvj—transcription made by Ernest L. Ackley at the Cambridge University Library. "Lamech" is a common form of "Lambeth." The date of this edition proves that Peckham's influence extended into the sixteenth cenutry.

13 *E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 118, p. 102. The note was apparently written by Canon Simmons—see p. vii.

"Item nullus admitti debet ad sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Iesu Christi extra mortis articulum nisi fuerit confirmatus. Vel nisi a receptione sacramenti confirmationis fuerit rationabiliter impeditus. in constitu. lamech pecchā. ca. confirmationis".[14]

2. The *Speculum Christiani.* This work, written by John Watton (or Wotton, or Walton),[15] was a popular manual "drawn up explicitly for preachers, with its crude rhymes and its medley of Latin and English".[16] It begins with an explicit reference to Peckham's Constitutions of Lambeth: "Dicam breviter quid habetur in constucōe Lambeth Pecham ca. de Ignorancia sacerdotis ubi sic habetur".[17] Then follows practically the whole "Peckham programme". Deanesly remarks[18] that this manual "did for the south of England and the fifteenth century what Gaytrik's treatise had done for the north and the fourteenth".

Its popularity is attested by the existence of the thirty-three MSS., to which Wells refers,[19] the oldest dating from about 1400. Wells believes[20] that the "direct use" of its treatment of the Ten Commandments in the *Doctors* (in *The Towneley Plays*) has been demonstrated by Carleton Brown,[21] who assigns the original composition of the manual to "the last decade of the fourteenth century".[22] If the Towneley play did thus incorporate Watton's version of Peckham's treatment of the Decalogue, Peckham's influence must have reached a very large number of people, even if the "passage in the Towneley Play was not introduced into the text until well on toward the middle of the fifteenth century".[23]

In the edition of 1484, "there is a total of approximately two hundred lines of English verse and about four pages of English prose—otherwise it is in Latin. Its treatment of the different items . . . is very brief and concise. The book itself is small and

---

14 These data are drawn directly from transcriptions made for the writer by Mr. Ackley in the Cambridge University Library.

15 Owst, *op. cit.*, p. 291 and note 2. Extended quotations are given on p. 4; and Gasquet, *The Old English Bible,* p. 199f., gives many details.

16 Owst, *loc. cit.*

17 Edition of 1484—transcription made by Ernest L. Ackley.

18 *Op. cit.*, p. 346.

19 In *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, Supplement I,* p. 968. Cf. Deanesly's comment, "the commonest of these manuals", *op. cit.*, p. 346.

20 *Op. cit.*, p. 993.

21 See *The Towneley "Play of the Doctors" and the "Speculum Christiani"* in *Modern Language Notes,* vol. xxxi (1916), 223f.

22 *Op. cit.*, p. 225.

23 Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 226. See also G. C. Taylor, *The Relation of the English Corpus Christi Play to the Middle English Religious Lyric,* in *Modern Philology,* vol. v (1907-8), p. 1ff., especially p. 28.

would slip into your pocket. I judge that it was made thus to be handy as a manual for priests and for literate laymen".[24] It was also printed in 1500, 1502, and 1513,[25] thus demonstrating again, as in the case of the *Pupilla Oculi* (*q. v.*), that Peckham's influence extended down into the sixteenth century.

3. *Oculus Sacerdotis* (and *Cilium Oculi Sacerdotis*).

Presumably written by William de Pagula (Page) in the middle of the first half of the fourteenth century. Deanesly states[26] that the latter work is simply Part IV of the former treatise. Owst does not assert this directly, but he quotes[27] MS. Guildhall Libr. London, 249, fols. 391-484 as stating that the *Cilium* was "quoddam additamentum *Oculo Sacerdotis*".

The work became very popular,[28] but it now exists only in MSS.[29] (which the present writer has not been able to examine), and the likelihood of Peckham's influence can be deduced only indirectly. However, the argument seems to be double. First, John de Burgo, whose indebtedness to Peckham has been demonstrated in the consideration of the *Pupilla Oculi* (*q. v.*), acknowledges in his preface that his *Pupilla Oculi* "is to a large extent drawn from another work entitled *Oculus Sacerdotis*".[30] Since Burgo was influenced by Peckham, it is reasonable to assume that his pattern also was marked by the same influence. In the *Dextra Pars Oculi* occur parochial discourses to be delivered once every quarter throughout the year.[31] This is very reminiscent of Peckham's requirement.

The second line of argument is this: Another writer of manuals, John Myrc, drew very heavily upon the *Oculus Sacerdotis* and probably shows Peckham's influence. This will be shown in the consideration of Myrc's *Instructions for Parish Priests* (*q. v.*), where Owst and Deanesly are quoted as regarding Myrc's *Instructions* as merely a verse translation of part of the *Oculus Sacerdotis*. An investigation of the Balliol manuscript might prove profitable.

---

24 Ernest L. Ackley in some personal correspondence with the present writer. Mr. Ackley adds that the volume which he has examined is small quarto, about 5″ x 7″, the *Speculum* proper occupying 192 pages of the 232 pages comprising this edition.

25 See Gasquet, *Old English Bible,* p. 200, note.

26 *Op. cit.,* p. 202.

27 *Op. cit.,* p. 298, note 4.

28 See Owst, *op. cit.,* p. 296f.

29 MS. Roy. 6. E. 1; MS. Adv. Libr. Edinb. 18. 3. 6; MS. Guildhall Libr. London, 249: MS. Harl. 2276. See Owst, *loc. cit.*

30 Gasquet, *Old English Bible,* p. 197.

31 Gasquet, *loc. cit.*

H. W. C. Davis states[32]: "The Oculus Sacerdotis quotes Peckham's constitution Quum Malum (of 1279) as regulating the times and seasons of baptism (Balliol MS. fo.33)".

4. *Flos Florum.* This was written early in the fifteenth century,[33] partly in Latin and partly in English, and is found in MS. Burney 356. Book iiij contains miscellaneous items of information for priests, including a collection of synodal constitutions among which is "Item in constitucione iohannis peccham. edita apud lambeth . . .".[34] A little farther on[35] occurs the following: "Quilibet sacerdos parochialis sive curatus tenetur parochianos suos praedicare et docere in lingua materna quater in anno videlicet: In primis Septem peticiones in oratione dominica. Salutacionem beatae et gloriosae virginis Mariae. Duodecim articulos fidei in simbolo contentos. Decem praecepta decalogi. Septem mortalia peccata. Septem opera misericordiae. Septem virtutes cardinales. Duo praecepta evangelii. Septem sacramenta ecclesiae. Excommunicaciones a canone latas, viz., maiòr et minor". This is plainly what Owst terms "the 'Peckham' programme",[36] and it is followed by Book v, which gives an exposition of these very points.[37] In Book x occurs "Ignorancia. Omne opus sacerdotum in praedicacione et doctrina constat. atque edificent cunctos".[38] This may, or may not, refer to Peckham's constitution commonly known as "Ignorantia sacerdotum".

5. *Regimen Animarum.* This work was compiled about 1343[39] by an unknown author, and can now be found in MS.Harl.2272. Its Prologue states:[40] "Compilavi enim hoc opusculum ex quibusdam libris, viz. Summa Summarum Raymundi, Summa confessoris et veritatis theologie, Pars Oculi sacerdotis, et de libro venerabilis Anselmi . . . omnia precipua que per Canones & Constituciones Provinciales precipiuntur scire, & Parochianis exponere, & inter ipsos in Ecclesia predicare, in hac modica Summa per ordinem conscribuntur, et in tres partes dividuntur: quarum . . . tercia, de

---

32 "The Canon Law in England", *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte,* xxxiv (1913), Kanonistische Abteilung III, 350.

33 Owst, *op. cit.,* p. 298.

34 Folio 41b or p. 78. The data regarding this MS. have been kindly furnished by Mr. Ackley after consulting the MS.

35 Fol. 43 or p. 81.

36 *Op. cit.,* p. 298, note 5.

37 Folios 43b to 55b or pages 82-106. Owst, *op. cit.,* p. 359, gives a selection from fol. 50b.

38 Folio 105b or p. 206.

39 Owst, *op. cit.,* pp. 1 and 297.

40 Given (in part) in Owst, *op. cit.,* p. 297, note 5, and p. 298, note 5. Cf. also Gasquet, *Old English Bible,* p. 198.

septem Sacramentis Ecclesie, et eorum Ministrationibus in illis faciendis".

Here we find (1) explicit acknowledgment of dependence upon the *Oculus Sacerdotis* (*q. v.*), which in all probability was influenced by Peckham: (2) a claim to such completeness (*omnia precipua*) as would imply the inclusion of Peckham's decrees in this collection of "Constitutiones Provinciales"; and (3) a separate section (*tertia pars*) is devoted to the treatment of the seven sacraments, a procedure which was followed in two instances where the evidence of Peckham's influence is conclusive, *viz.*, MS. Lambeth 460, and MS. Lansdowne 376, which was the basis for the *Exornatorium Curatorum* (*q. v.*). While these facts do not constitute irrefragable proof that the *Regimen Animarum* exhibits Peckham's influence, these three facts make it highly probable that such is the case.

This probability develops into certainty upon closer inspection[41] of the MS., for folio 92[a], column 1, is found to contain: "Ultimo debet sacerdos parochialis frequenter diebus festivis soiempnibus inter missarum solempnia publicare excommunicaciones latas in consiliis exoniensis & de lambeth peccham & excommunicaciones a canone latas frequencius occurrentes . . ." Folio 90[a], column 2, has an equally clear and indubitable reference to the archbishop: "Item instruere debet eosdem sacramentum ore sumptum non nimis comminuere dentibus, set tritum modico in orbem per sancte ne aliqua particula eveniat in dencium intersticijs vel alibi remaneat. In constitucione provinciale de lameth peccham. circa. Altissimus".

6. *Manuale Sacerdotum.* This Latin work was by John Myrc, about 1403. Myrc's English work, *Instructions for Parish Priests,* may not have been *merely* a translation[42] of his Latin work, but in view of the fact that the English work betrays indications of Peckham's influence, it is significant that the additional Latin chapters[43] frequently deal with subjects which Peckham also dealt with in his Lambeth tract, his injunctions, and his official letters. This work is to be found in two MSS.[44] and Owst believes[45] also in a third, *viz.*, MS York Cath. Libr. xvi. O. 11, described in the *Explicit* as "Libellus dictus Manuale Sacerdotis Kirkestall".

---

41 An inspection kindly performed for the present writer by Mr. Ackley in the British Museum.

42 Owst, *op. cit.*, p. 54, note 6.

43 *Ibid.*, p. 47, note 1.

44 MS. Camb. Univ. Libr. Ff. 1. 14; and MS. York Cath. Libr. xvi, L. 8.

45 *Op. cit.*, p. 47, note 1.

7. *Compilatio Brevis.* This was a Latin treatise on the usual lines[46] by the energetic friar John Brackley (or Brakley or Brakkele). Its Prologue states that it is "ad instructionem juniorum, quibus non vacat opusculorum variorum prolixitatem perscrutari de dictis Catholicorum magistrorum".[47] It appears, however, to make no explicit reference to Peckham or to the Lambeth decrees.[48] Whether this was due to the author's being a Dominican and hence inclined to slur over the work of the Franciscan Archbishop is an interesting subject for conjecture.

8. MS. Lambeth 460. This MS. was probably written near the middle of the fourteenth century. There is no title in the handwriting of the MS. itself, but a fly-leaf, written in the seventeenth century,[49] gives as a title "Anonymi Compilatio in Johannis Peckami Constitutionem, quae incipit, Ignorantia Sacerdotum, exceptis VII Sacramentis". This first section ends on fol.120, where the explicit reads as follows: "Explicit sana doctrina super illo capitulo ignorancia sacerdotum exceptis 7 sacramentis de quibus dicam infra".

The second section, known as the "Tractatus de VII Sacramentis", opens with a table of contents of the Seven Sacraments, extending from fol.120^{a1} to fol.123^{b2} where "explicit tabula" is written. The tract itself opens on fol.124 and extends to fol.172.

The first section opens with Peckham's constitution, *Ignorantia sacerdotum,*[50] followed by "Pro uberiori intellectu istius capituli summi constitucionis fratris Johannis peccham Cantuariensis archiepiscopi editi apud lameth etcetera Anectit compilator suum libellum". An elaborate table of contents[51] is then given, including such items as "inter predicationem et doctrinam", "De fide et articulis fidei", "Quod X dicuntur mandata". Book i deals chiefly with the Ten Commandments, while Book ii treats of the Seven Deadly Sins, the Seven Works of Mercy, &c. Book iii deals with such diverse topics as perfection, poverty, claustral life, pilgrimages, humility, human praise, contemplation, love of God, &c., ending on folio 120.

---

46 Owst, *op. cit.*, p. 284. In MS. Cambr. Univ. Libr. Ff. 1. 18, fol. 7 *et seq.* See Owst, *op. cit.*, p. 285, note 1.

47 *Ibid.*, p. 285. Cf. pp. 44 and 227.

48 Mr. Ackley reports that he feels certain that neither is mentioned within the fifty folios comprising this work.

49 By Archbishop Sancroft. Mr. Ackley has very kindly consulted the MS. in Lambeth Palace Library for the data here given.

50 Through the section which ends at the top of column 2, p. 56 of Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii.

51 Folios 4^{a} to 6^{b}.

The second section, the *Tractatus de VII Sacramentis,* opens with its own table of contents and discusses five of the sacraments, *viz.,* baptism, confirmation, the Eucharist, penance, and matrimony, at considerable length.[52]

9. MS. Add.24660. This is "a set of the briefest Latin sermons of the fourteenth century (which) deal exclusively with each leading point of doctrine prescribed by the Peckham Decrees, in turn".[53] It has quaint verses which epitomize the sacraments, a veritable "Sermo de vii Sacramentis".[54] It has not been possible for the present writer to determine the degree of Peckham's influence upon this MS.

10. MS. Bodl.110 (No. 1963 in the *Summary Catalogue*). This MS., written partly in Latin and partly in English, seems to contain possible indications of Peckham's influence.[55] Folio 155[a] has the following:—

"Sacerdos parochialis tenetur per canones docere et predicare in lingua materna *quater in anno* septem peticiones in oratione dominica salutacionem beate marie. Quatuor decim articulos fidei contentos in cimbalo. Decem precepta veteris testamenti vij mortalia peccata septem virtutes principales. Duo precepta evangelij septem sacramenta ecclesie. Excommunicaciones a canone latas . . . Septem peticiones in oracione dominica continetur sic: In the pater noster buth seuene byddyngus that good hym self ordeynede myldefulliche. . . ."[56]

11. MS. Merton 217. This MS. cites Peckham as its authority in at least four places, *viz.,* "In constitutione de Lamech peccham c c sacramentum";[57] "In constitutione provinciale de Lambeth peccham c altissimus";[58] "in consiliis exon. & de lameth peccham";[59] and "in constitutione provinciale de Lameth peccham.

---

52 Some additional facts regarding this MS. are given by Martin in *Reg.,* vol. iii, p. cxxxiii. He seems to believe that this MS. was written by a monk named Holme, from the appearance of this name within the limits of the MS.

53 Owst, *op. cit.,* p. 283. But Mr. Ackley writes that this MS. omits mention of the Works of Mercy, and that it does not explicitly mention either Peckham or the Lambeth Constitutions.

54 *Ibid.,* p. 272 and note 2.

55 *Ibid.,* p. 284, note 4.

56 Transcription kindly furnished by Mr. Ackley, who adds: "John Stratford is mentioned at the close . . . but I cannot find any direct allusions to Lambeth or Peckham."

57 fol. 142a1.

58 fol. 143a1.

59 fol. 144a1.

c ignorancia".[60] Mr. Ackley describes this manuscript as a veritable encyclopedia of religious knowledge, containing 480 folios, and including "a specific and rather thorough-going exposition of the whole 'Peckham Program' ".

English Manuals

12. Archbishop Thoresby had a translation made of his Constitutions, which (it will be remembered) were largely a repetition of Peckham's Lambeth decrees, and had this translation included in his own official register at York, both versions being dated from his manor of Cawood, on November 25, 1357, says Canon Nolloth.[61] This translation is "really a very wide expansion of the original text: evidently for the sake of fuller explanation and clearer understanding by the lay-folk".[62] Thus were Peckham's *Constitutions* translated into English, "fashioned ready for the pulpit and multiplied".[63]

In this expanded form the Lambeth tract was sometimes called "Dan Gaytrige's Sermon", because the translation had been made by one John Gaytrige, a Benedictine monk of York.[64] This discloses the fact that a medieval bishop was quite able to issue a tract in the vernacular as an official publication, if he wished to do so.[65] Forty days indulgence was granted to those who learned "the six things" of the tract by heart.[66] It would seem quite possible that this translation forms, as it were, a sort of connecting link by which ecclesiastical legislation crossed over into clerical manuals.

The section dealing with the Ten Commandments occurs also among the prose treatises of MS. Rawl. C. 285, fol.57[b] ff, and in consequence of this fact it was for a long time ascribed, erroneously, to Richard Rolle.[67] It occurs also in MS. Arund. 507 (which has slight additions from Rolle), MS. Harl. 1022, and MS. Thornton, Cambr. Trin. Coll. B. 10, York,[68] which has been edited by Perry in *Religious Pieces in Prose and Verse*.[69]

---

60 fol. 145a1.

61 *E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 118, pp. xv-xvii.

62 *Ibid.*, p. xvii.

63 Owst, *op. cit.*, p. 282.

64 Cf. Deanesly, *op. cit.*, p. 141, note 3.

65 *Ibid., loc. cit.*

66 *E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 118, pp. 3 and 98-99.

67 See Horstmann, *Yorkshire Writers: Richard Rolle of Hampole* (London and New York, 1895-6), vol. i, p. 104; and Owst, *op. cit.*, p. 289.

68 Cf. Horstmann, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 108 note 5, 132, 157, 195 and note 1.

69 *E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 26. See especially pp. [v] - vii.

13. Lollard Adaptation. Not many years later[70] either Wyclif himself or one of his followers made an adaptation of Dan Gaytrige's Sermon. This Wycliffite version has been printed[71] with its literary antecedents[72] in such a way[73] that any reader may readily perceive the relationships existing between the four documents. These seem to be quite patent enough to justify the conclusion of the editor that this Lollard version is a direct descendant of Peckham's Lambeth Constitutions through Thoresby and Dan Gaytrige.[74]

Nolloth is convinced that Wyclif himself was the author of the Adaptation,[75] and gives excellent reasons (*q. v.*) for accepting this conjecture. His arguments, however, in favor of the proposition that "Wyclif asked for and obtained the consent of the Archbishop (Thoresby) at the very least, if not his assistance, in his amplification of the *Lay Folks' Catechism*" are not so convincing, and must remain (as Canon Nolloth is aware) in the realm of the conjectural.[76]

But it is not necessary to prove that Thoresby gave his consent to the amplification in order to establish the connection between the two documents—the internal evidence (*q. v.*) seems quite ample to do that. It is, however, significant for an appraisal of Peckham's influence to note that his Lambeth tract was expanded by such a popular leader as Wyclif, and that in this amplified form the Lambeth instruction probably reached a large number of English readers and hearers through the disseminating agency of Wyclif's "Poor Priests".[77]

The *Speculum Vitae Christianiae* was formerly attributed to Wyclif,[78] but it is now regarded by Wells as "a manual of religious instruction written in English in 1387 by direction of Thoresby, Archbishop of York".[79] Wells apparently copied this statement

---

70 About 1365. See *E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 118, p. xxiii, note 2.

71 *E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 118.

72 *I. e.,* Dan Gaytrige's Sermon (English), Thoresby's Constitutions (Latin), and Peckham's Lambeth Constitutions.

73 Dan Gaytrige's Sermon appears on the upper part of the left-hand pages; Thoresby's original Latin appears below this; the Lollard adaptation appears on the upper part of the right-hand pages; and Peckham's Lambeth decrees appear below this.

74 *Op. cit.,* pp. xx-xxvii.

75 *Loc. cit.*

76 *Loc. cit.,* especially pp. xxvi and xxvii. Cf. Owst, *op. cit.,* p. 291.

77 Cf. Capes, *op. cit.,* pp. 125-31.

78 Cf. *The English Works of Wycklif* (F. D. Matthew, editor), *E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 74, p. xlix.

79 *Op. cit.,* p. 481.

from Arnold[80] but evidently made an error in the date, for Thoresby died in 1373[81] and Arnold gave the date as 1357, which was the very year in which Thoresby had Gaytrige translate the York Constitutions, and which is probably the correct date.

That the *Speculum Vitae Christianiae* (as Dr. Shirley labels it)[82] is really only the Lollard Adaptation of Dan Gaytrige's Sermon may readily be seen by a scrutiny of Shirley's *Catalogue*[83] which has entered items 1 and 7[84] of No. 11 as follows:—

> "1. In mandatum Domini Johannis de Thoresby Archiepiscopi Eboracensis. . . .
> MS. Lamb. 408.
> "7. Six Things to know God Almighty. . . . .
> MS. Lamb. 408."

The proof of identity consists in the fact that MS. Lambeth 408 is the same MS. which Canon Simmons used[85] as the basis for his edition of the Lollard Adaptation of Dan Gaytrige's version of Thoresby's Constitutions.[86]

14. There is also some reason to believe that Peckham's influence extended to a third of the English manuals, *viz.*, Myrc's *Instructions for Parish Priests*.[87] The following material is found both in Peckham's Constitutions and in Myrc's *Instructions*:—

> Baptism not to be administered twice
> The form of baptism may be in Latin or in English
> Confirmation emphasized
> The Articles of Faith
> The Seven Sacraments
> Conditional ("hypothetical") baptism
> The Ten Commandments
> The Seven Deadly Sins
> The Viaticum—with surplice, stole, light, bell
> The Sacrament to be reserved with care

One passage in particular Peacock declares a simple translation of the corresponding passage in the Lambeth Constitutions.[88] Peckham had written: "Doceant (sacerdotes) etiam eosdem illud,

---

[80] *Select Works of John Wycklif* (Oxford, 1869-71), vol. iii, pp. v and vi.

[81] Waterman, *Tables of Episcopal Descent* (New York, 1903), p. 38.

[82] In *A Catalogue of the original works of John Wycklif* (Oxford, 1865), p. 38.

[83] Pp. 38-40.

[84] These are the same items which Wells (*loc. cit.*) says constitute the *Speculum Vitae Christianiae*.

[85] See *E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 118 (published in 1901), p. 106, *viz.*, the note on page 12. L. 169. Cf. *E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 74 (published in 1880), p. xlix and note 4.

[86] Cf. Owst, *op. cit.*, p. 291, note 4.

[87] *E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 31.

[88] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

quod ipsis eisdem temporibus in calice propinatur, sacramentum non esse, sed vinum purum eis hauriendum, traditum, ut facilius sacrum corpus glutiant quod perceperunt".[89]

Myrc[90] has the following:—

Teche hem thenne, neuer the later
That in the chalys ys but wyn & water
That they receyueth for to drynke
After that holy hoselynge;
Therfore warne hem thou schal
That they ne chewe that ost to smal,
Leste to smale they done hyt breke,
And in here teth hyt do steke;
There-fore they schule wyth water & wyn
Clanse here mowth, that noght leue ther-In

Peacock states[91] that after communion it was the custom for the laity to drink unconsecrated wine, to assist them in swallowing the eucharistic wafer. The purchase of wine for this use sometimes appears in old accounts, says Peacock and adds that King Henry VII and his queen partook of a chalice of this kind at their coronation.

Both Owst[92] and Deanesly[93] regard Myrc's *Instructions for Parish Priests* as a verse translation, in the ordinary free fashion of that day, of Part II of the *Oculus Sacerdotis* by Pagula (Page). Now if Peckham's influence upon Myrc may be considered proven, Peckham's influence upon Page[94] follows *a fortiori.*

15. Peckham's influence can also be demonstrated in the case of a work composed "in the first quarter of the fifteenth century"[95] and known as *Jacob's Well.* Not only do such chapter headings[96] as those on the Great Sentence (of excommunication), on the Deadly Sins, the Virtues, the Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer suggest the "Peckham Outlines of Faith"; but the *constitucionibus . . . Lamheth,* & *Redyng,*[97] the *constitu-*

---

89 Wilkins, *Concila,* vol. ii, p. 52.

90 *Op. cit.,* lines 250-259. See also Cutts' extended note on this passage — *Parish Priests and their People,* p. 235. Cutts (*ibid.,* p. 239) terms a later section of the *Instruction* "a digest of Archbishop Peckham's famous canon of instruction for preaching."

91 *E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 31, p. 79.

92 *Op. cit.,* p. 297 and note 4. See also p. 54f.

93 *Op. cit.,* p. 343f. See also Peacock, *op. cit.,* p. vi.

94 Page's *Oculus Sacerdotis* exists only in MS. and has not been examined.

95 Edited by Arthur Brandeis, in *E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 115.

96 *Ibid.,* p. (xiv) - xvi.

97 *Ibid.,* p. 17, line 4.

cionibus Lamheth, Pecham, capitulo 'Tantum inualuit',[98] and the *constitucionibus lamheth, Pecham, 'Tantum inualuit'*[99] are referred to explicitly.

Speaking of this work, Brandeis says:[100] "Neither the matter nor the form of this book is original or novel. *Jacob's Well* belongs to that numerous class of manuals, in prose and verse, whose object it was to condense the whole penitential lore of the time into a code for the use of laymen or clerical persons. Though their ancestry was already profuse in the first part of the fifteenth century—we need only mention the *Ayenbite of Inwit, Prick of Conscience, Handlyng Synne,* &c., down to Chaucer's *Parson's Tale,* most of which are either directly or indirectly derived from *Le Somme des Vices et des Vertues,* by Frère Lorens—their name seems about that period to have become legion."

16. The *Speculum Christiani* by Roger Byrde[101] is an English translation of the *Speculum Christiani* by John Watton, and therefore (since Watton acknowledged his indebtedness to Peckham) continued the Primate's influence to a still larger circle of readers. Explicit reference to the Lambeth Constitutions occurs on folio 3^b and runs as follows: "In constitucione lambeth dicitur. We bydde & commaunde that every curat expowne & declare openly to the pepil. by hym selfe or be anothyr. on a solempne day. or mo. eche quarter ones. The articles of the fayth. The ten commaundmentis. The two preceptys of the gospel. The seven werkys of pyte. The seven dedly synnes. wyth ther braunches. The seven principal vertuse. And the seven sacramentis of grace. . . ."[102]

17. *Exornatorium* (*Exoneratorium, Exornatorum*) *Curatorum.*

Except for the Latin titles, this work is in English. It exists in printed form without any title in MS. Lansdowne 379, and was printed with the title *Exoneratorium Curatorum* by Thomas Godfray, probably in 1532.[103] In the Lansdowne MS. it begins on fol. 23 with the words, "Constit. provinc. Johan. Peccham, de officio

---

98 *Ibid.,* p. 19, line 31.

99 *Ibid.,* p. 24, line 17.

100 *Ibid.,* p. vi.

101 MS. Harl. 6580. See Owst, *op. cit.,* p. 4, note 3.

102 This MS. seems to belong to the middle or latter half of the fifteenth century. The data here given were secured by Mr. Ackley at the British Museum.

103 Also by Wynken de Worde in 1520. (Data supplied by Mr. E. L. Ackley.) Cf. Gasquet, *Old English Bible,* p. 191. There was also an edition by Richarde Pynson (London) in 1520, and still another edition by Henry Pepwell in 1530 (titled *Exornator[i]um Curatorum*). Cf. also the work by Julian Notary in 1519, mentioned by Martin, *op. cit.,* vol. iii, p. cxliv.

archipresbyteri, capitulo—Ignoranc. sac. . . ."[104] In Godfray's edition it begins: "In constit. provinc. Johīs Pecham de officijs archipresbyteri. Cap. ignorañ sacerd'. It is ordayned and decreed by holy chirch/that every curate havyinge cure of soule/shal shewe and declare unto his / parishyns four tymes in the / yere. The. xiiij artycles of the faithe / the. x. commaundementes of our lorde god / the. vij. workes of mercy / The vij. deedly synnes / with the braunches ther of / the. vij. principall vertues / and the. vij. sacramētes of holy churche / with other thīges necessary / as shall appear here after". Then follows an exposition of these points as far as the section allotted to the sacraments.

This section seems to begin with a new heading,[105] thus: "In constit. Johñ Pecham de sacramētis iterādis vel non".[106] After some brief attention to baptism, confirmation, and penance, slightly more space is accorded to the Eucharist. In the middle of this treatment[107] occurs "In consti. Johñ Pecham de summa trinitate et fide catholica. Cap. altissimus."[108]

18. The *Quatuor Sermones.* "One of the earliest books ever issued from an English press by Caxton, probably in 1483, . . . was a set of four lengthy discourses, published, as they expressly declare, to enable priests to fulfil the obligation imposed upon them by the Constitutions of Peckham. As these were intended to take at least four Sundays, and as the whole set of instructions had to be given four times each year, it follows that at least sixteen Sundays, or a quarter of the year, were devoted to this simple and straightforward teaching of what every Christian was bound to believe and to do".[109]

These discourses were known as the *"Quatuor Sermones"* and have been reprinted by the Roxburghe Club[110] with considerable care. From the statement made by Gasquet and quoted above, one is naturally led to expect to find in them an "express declaration"

---

104 See Owst, *op. cit.*, p. 284, note 4.

105 Cf. a similar division in MS. Lamb. 460.

106 Page A. v., line 4.

107 Page A. vi.

108 This use of the phrase "Cap. altissimus" confirms the argument employed in establishing Peckham's relation to the Quivil decrees, *supra.* Cf. also its recurrence in the *Regimen Animarum, supra.*

109 Gasquet, *Parish Life,* p. 218. Cf. also his *Old English Bible,* p. 189.

110 Nichols and Sons, London. 1883. For the purpose of ascertaining the accuracy of this reprint, it has been examined by Mr. C. Hindle in the Bodleian Library, who writes: "I have carefully compared several passages of this reprint with our copy of the original and have found no inaccuracies. The only variations from the original are in a few cases where an inverted letter 'u' or 'n' in the original has been rectified in the reprint."

that they are based upon the requirement laid down by Peckham; but a careful examination of these discourses fails to reveal Peckham's name in any part of the work.

19. MS. Cambr. Dd. XII, 69. Folios 24-31 are of the fourteenth century and are chiefly in English. They give the Peckham "program with a fair degree of exactness".[111]

20. MS. Linc. Cath. Libr. A.6.2, fols.64, 64[b] would seem to be a "late fifteenth-century vernacular preacher's presentation of the same[112] in outline *in a sermon,* Dom. v[a] post oct. Epiphanie' ".[113]

MS. Dd.IX,38 (Cambridge), MS. Harl.2349, and MS. Roy. 18.B.xxiii would all seem to belong in the same family of manuals or sermon-collections,[114] and might reward further investigation. It is also worthy of note that Wordsworth states[115] that "after searching in a few great libraries . . . I have reckoned over one hundred editions of books of this description" (*i. e.,* on "the lines of the Lambeth Constitutions of John Peckham".)

* * * *

The materials incorporated in the Lambeth decrees re-appeared not only in manuals intended for the use of the clergy but also in the *Primers* designed, at least occasionally, for the use of the laity. Some of these *Primers,* e. g., Maskell's,[116] appeared as early as 1400, and others at various dates until 1545. 'But all existing editions were superseded in 1545 A. D. by "The Primer set forth by the King's Majesty and his clergy to be taught, learned, and read: and none other to be used throughout all his dominions" '.[117] This edition of 1545 was a part of the program of standardization promoted by Henry VIII, and its explicit prohibition of other editions operated to exclude the *name* of Peckham from about this time, but it does not necessarily mark a termination of his influence.

---

111 Mr. Ackley — in some personal correspondence.

112 *I. e.,* "each leading point of doctrine prescribed by the Peckham Decrees, in turn" — Owst, *op. cit.,* p. 283. Cf. p. 27, note 3.

113 Owst, *op. cit.,* p. 283, note 1. See also p. 201, note 1.

114 Cf. *ibid.,* pp. 21, note 1, 22, note 1, 283 and 291.

115 See Wordsworth & Littlehales, *The Old Service-Books of the English Church* (London, 1904), p. 262.

116 Luckock, H. M., *Studies in the History of the Book of Common Prayer* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1910), p. 1.

117 *Ibid.,* p. 2.

SUMMARY OF

Peckham's Influence upon Clerical Manuals.

Latin:—

1. Pupilla Oculi* — *Certain*
2. Speculum Christiani—by Watton — *Certain*
3. Oculus Sacerdotis (and the Cilium Oculi Sacerdotis)
4. Flos Florum* — *Certain*
5. Regimen Animarum*** — *Certain*
6. Manuale Sacerdotum
7. Compilatio brevis
8-11. Four un-named MSS.: Lambeth 460* — *Certain*
   Add. 24660
   Bodl. 110
   Merton 217 — *Certain*

English:—

12. Dan Gaytrige's Sermon
13. Lollard Adaptation of *supra* (and the Speculum Vitae Christianae
14. Instructions for Parish Priests
15. Jacob's Well — *Certain*
16. Speculum Christiani—by Byrde* — *Certain*
17. Exornatorium Curatorum — *Certain*
18. Quatuor Sermones
19-20. Two un-named MSS.: Camb. Univ. Libr. Dd. XII. 69
   Linc. Cath. Libr. A. 6. 2.

---

* The actual evidence, *i. e.*, the word "Peckham" or "Lambeth," is here reproduced — probably for the first time.

*** Peckham's influence, with the supporting MS. evidence, is here specifically noted — probably for the first time.

VII

UPON SCHOOL CURRICULA, &c.

Peckham's influence upon religious education extended also to matter beyond the limits of books of ecclesiastical legislation, clerical manuals, and sermon-collections. His influence can perhaps be seen in the prescription of definitely religious elements in the curriculum of at least one school, and in the continuance of his insistence upon Confirmation as a prerequisite[1] of the reception of the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist throughout the Anglican Communion.

The foundation deed for the school and almshouse at Childrey, Berks, placed under the tutelage of Queen's College, Oxford, by Sir William Fettiplace on July 20, 1526, directs the master to teach (among other things) the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, the Ten Commandments, the seven Deadly Sins, the seven sacraments, the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, the seven works of mercy, both corporeal and spiritual, and the manner of confession —a curriculum peculiarly reminiscent of Peckham's decrees and of his *Formula Confessionum*. To the Protestant of that day, this curriculum savored more of superstition than of religious education,[2] and it quite naturally becomes more difficult to trace Peckham's influence beyond this period of turmoil and reconstruction.

In one other way Peckham's influence persisted until the Reformation—and indeed even down to the present day. He required[3] every child to be confirmed by a bishop before presuming to receive the Holy Communion. In cathedral towns and in small dioceses, where the bishop himself could be present at all christenings, confirmation followed immediately after the baptism so that it came to be looked upon as almost a part of it. But where it was impossible for the bishop to be present at the baptism, confirmation was postponed until the bishop could be present and perform the act in person. In Peckham's time the laity had grown lax in this matter and were becoming increasingly neglectful of confirmation, so the Archbishop found it necessary to insist that children should be

---

[1] Cf. Proctor and Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 606, note 2.

[2] Leach, *Schools of Medieval England*, p. 300.

[3] See the Lambeth Constitution, "De sacramento confirmationis," Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. ii, p. 53: "Confirmatationis . . . sacramentum multi negligunt temerarie," etc.

brought to the bishop and confirmed by him before they were admitted to the Lord's Supper.

This requirement still remains in effect throughout the entire Anglican Communion, the fourth[4] largest body of Christians in the world; and even today thousands of children and adults are receiving the prescribed religious instruction[5] preparatory to confirmation is a prerequisite[6] to receiving the Holy Eucharist. Thus Peckham's influence is still felt, not only in England, but also throughout the entire Anglican Communion.

---

[4] Surpassed in numbers by only the Roman Catholics, the Eastern Orthodox, and the Lutheran bodies.

[5] As set forth in the Catechism in the *Book of Common Prayer.*

[6] Cf. Little, A. W., *Reasons for Being a Churchman* (London and Milwaukee, no date), pp. 213-4: "A French custom, which is common among English and American Romanists, of regularly admitting to First Communion before Confirmation, is an uncatholic and illogical reversion of the divine order of Sacramental Grace; and was severely denounced by the late Pope Leo XIII."

VIII

EVALUATION OF HIS WORK

In formulating an evaluation of Peckham's importance as a Religious Educator, it seems reasonable to assume that any adequate appraisal of his importance must be based upon (1) his WORK, and (2) his INFLUENCE; hence an attempt has been made in the following pages to appraise both of these factors. His WORK is appraised under the heads,

1. His injunctions to monasteries;
2. His directions to the seculars;
3. His reforms at Oxford University; and
4. His regulations affecting the laity.

These four estimates have then been combined to form an appraisal of Peckham's work, its extent, its educational soundness and its value for Religious Education. His INFLUENCE is evaluated as to its effect upon

1. Later ecclesiastical legislation;
2. Clerical manuals; and
3. Curricula, &c.

These three estimates have been combined to form an appraisal of Peckham's influence, its extent and its effectiveness.

1. His Injunctions to Monasteries.

Extent. Peckham's labors to elevate the tone of monastic life were unremitting, fearless, and extensive. He began his efforts almost immediately upon his arrival in England as archbishop,[1] and continued them as long as the record runs.[2] He dared to attack immorality and mismanagement even when abbots and priors of great power and influence were the offenders. He devoted his energies to both large and small houses, to both native and alien houses, to convents both for men and for women,[3] to the promotion not only of such improvements in administrative matters as would tend toward a higher ethical tone throughout the monastery, but also to

---

[1] *Reg.*, pp. 81-6 (November 19, 1279).

[2] *Reg.*, pp. 972-3 (July 28, 1290).

[3] See Index in vol. iii of the *Reg.* The number of people affected depended upon the size of the membership of the particular community. This varied from a very small number of members, a mere handful, up to 246 at Bury St. Edmunds in its most flourishing period. See Cutts, *op. cit.*, p. 510f.

the elevation of the prevailing standards of personal morality, and to such reforms as would increase the reverence with which the worship of God was being carried on. Since the monasteries contained such a considerable portion of the population at that time, the extent of his work was proportionately wide. It made itself felt in many places and in many ways throughout the entire duration of the period covered by the records, *viz.*, all but the last year or so of his episcopate.

Educational soundness. Peckham's methods were those which were characateristic of the age in which he was living: reproof, rebuke, censure, excommunication, the invocation of the secular arm where the church could not attain its end by its own methods of spiritual discipline. These would not be regarded as the best methods possible today, but no man can entirely transcend the limitations of his own time, and Peckham employed the methods which were currently approved and widely used in the church of that period. His penalties of compulsory fasts, of detention in dark rooms, of deprivation of the privileges of the monastery chapel, of deposition from office, and even of excommunication are not consonant with the principles of educational procedure accepted to-day and appear perhaps puerile and wasteful because of their reliance upon extraneous motivation and because of their lack of any rational or intrinsic connection with the offence. He sought to instil goodness by threats—a futile program, doomed to failure unless more constructive methods accompanied them.

But Peckham's methods were not limited to penalties and threats of punishment. He employed sound educational principles when he appointed auditing committees in order to correct misappropriation of funds, when he removed the possibility of scandal resulting from nuns confessing to a priest by ordering the confessions to be made in an open or public place, and when he enjoined frequent reception of the Holy Communion. On the whole, however, his methods were negative and punitive, and therefore weak from the modern standpoint.

Value for religious education. The archbishop's efforts with the monastics were probably the weakest of his contributions to the advancement of religious education; but they are not to be ignored. In whatever degree he elevated and purified the monastic life and held it up to its high ideal, in that same degree he improved the religious education which life in a monastery automatically provided. It is plain that he devoted unremitting efforts to spiritualizing the lives of the monks throughout his province, and it seems improbable

that no profit accrued to religious education from efforts so extensive and so long continued.

2. His directions to the seculars.

Extent. The Primate's directions to the secular clergy were designed to make them better pastors and were as unremitting, fearless and extensive as his efforts with the monastic clergy. Almost his first official act upon arriving in England was to summon the Council of Reading in order to deal with matters involving the personal morality of the clergy, the standards of their profession, and the promotion of reverence and of dignified and worthy church services; and his efforts in these directions continued until the end of his episcopate as recorded in his Register. He was fearless in his reforms, sparing neither bishop, archdeacon, nor dean in his zeal for instilling greater righteousness and a deeper sense of the responsibility resting upon all the clergy with cure of souls to discharge their duties in a honorable, efficient, and spiritual manner.

Educational soundness. The archbishop's efforts to make better pastors out of the clergy in his jurisdiction are open to the same criticisms as were his efforts to uplift the monastic life—too great a reliance upon threats and penalties, too little attention to the positive measures which a more inventive mind than his might have devised and turned to good account. His work possessed greater educational soundness when he employed more constructive means, e. g., when he urged rectors to greater care of their flock by a more careful and generous administration of the funds in their hands by which they could relieve the troubles and needs of their parishioners, and when he took steps to make the conduct of the church's services more reverent and impressive.

Value for religious education. The Primate's directions to the secular clergy possessed significance for religious education partly because they were aimed at "improvement in service", *i. e.,* at supplementing whatever instruction the clergy may have received in their earlier schooling, and thus constituting a form of theological education; and partly because any improvement in the moral or spiritual life of the clergy was bound to have an influence upon the position and esteem in which they would be held by the people whom they were expected to teach.

If Peckham's conflict with pluralism and absenteeism kept a person in one parish or cure, and thus made him more accessible to his flock, it is very probable that the sacraments would be administered with greater frequency and regularity and that the whole

educational work of the church would be more effectively maintained in that community than in a community which saw but little of its clergyman.[4] If, as a result of the archbishop's warnings to the rector, the parish funds were more generously applied to the relief of the necessities of the needy in the parish, the parishioners would naturally have greater respect for such a pastor than for one who was niggardly in the distribution of the funds at his disposal.

Much the same would hold true with regard to the Primate's refusing to allow ineligibles to hold benefices with cure of souls. Not much religious education can be given a congregation by a man whom the laity know to be ineligible to hold the position which he is occupying. If he were under age, they would resent his youth; if he were of illegitimate birth, they would resent it as a blemish upon his origin, his orders, and his social status; if he were not in sacred orders, they would be deprived of those ministrations which only priests were empowered to give.

As to the value of Peckham's regulation prohibiting the wearing of secular clothes by the clergy, opinion may be divided. But the possibility remains that it may have served to keep the priest continually aware of his sacred calling, thus serving as a constant stimulus to live up to the ethical and spiritual standards of the profession, and to refrain from occupations and recreations which would lower him in the eyes of his parishioners.

Greater reverence at the Holy Eucharist would have increased the teaching power of the service, as well as aiding the faithful in their own private and corporate devotions. The celebration of the mass every day with its accompanying ceremonial would have a similar effect. The greater attention to preaching which Peckham encouraged may well have meant an increment to the amount of religious education which the laity received.

3. His reforms at Oxford.

Extent. The Archbishop's reforms at Oxford University were not extensive, from the point of view of their bearing upon religious education. The propositions which he condemned as embodying erroneous teaching dealt with abstruse philosophical points whose bearing upon theology seems to the modern mind somewhat remote, except for the one matter of the Unity of Form. This philosophical conception had some definite bearing upon the doctrine of

[4] Cf. the *Statuta synodalia* (Norwich, 1257): "ne quis sacerdos in duabus ecclesiis ministrare praesumat, cum vix unus uni sufficere possit" — Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. i, p. 733.

transubstantiation, and hence possessed ramifications of considerable extent.[5]

The textbooks which Peckham prescribed are so difficult to identify that it would be rash to build any considerable argument upon the identifications proposed by Martin, and in all probability the change marked by their introduction was of no particular importance. It seems safe to say that Peckham's changes in the curriculum were not extensive.

Nor were his alterations in the administration of any great extent. To be sure, he was anxious that the vehicle of instruction in Merton College should again be Latin, and he ordered the reading of edifying books at meal-time. These changes would scarcely be considered extensive, nor were they, on the other hand, entirely negligible. They were, however, not such as to cause posterity to think of Peckham as a radical reformer revolutionizing the organization of the University of Oxford.

Educational soundness. Whether Peckham's method of supervision was sound from an educational point of view will depend upon the educational value of supervision exerted by means of injunctions, sharp letters, and fulminations of episcopal wrath. Perhaps he employed other methods not recorded; perhaps other methods would have been ineffectual in those rougher times. Opinions will probably differ as to the educational wisdom of his requirement that all the instruction in Merton College be given in the Latin tongue. Whatever books the students would later use would be in Latin; hence greater proficiency in Latin in the classroom might conceivably make for greater proficiency in whatever future work the student undertook. If Peckham was hoping that Merton might prove to be a feeder for the ministry, the step was undoubtedly wise.

Value for religious education. If Peckham's condemnation of the teaching prevalent at Oxford regarding the Unity of Form[6] was designed to protect the Church's doctrine of transubstantiation, his action may have had implications for religious education; but it seems impossible at this distance of time to specify with much pre-

---

[5] Cf. *Reg.*, p. 922f. Unity of Form also provided one of the grounds for the veneration of relics. See Sharp, *Franciscan Philosophy at Oxford in the Thirteenth Century*, p. 188.

[6] This subject is still to-day a matter of current debate within Franciscan circles. See, for example, Vogel, C. L., *Psychology and the Franciscan School* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., *c.* 1932). Plurality of Forms is discussed, p. 46f and p. 129f, and objections to it are marshalled, p. 138f. Plurality is regarded as gaining acceptance in biology and psychology, p. 46-9, at the present time.

cision the exact nature of the implications. His introduction of new textbooks must likewise remain in the field of conjecture until further discovery reveals the nature of the textbooks themselves. The effect of the additional instruction in Latin must also remain hypothetical; it may have made some future priests more proficient in the language of the Church and thus a bit more able to minister the sacraments and understand the Church's formularies. The lections at meals may have borne some real fruit. The reading may have presented religious gems which the Merton students might otherwise never have heard. But it presented these spiritual truths at such an inopportune time that the effectiveness of their presentation may indeed be seriously doubted.

4. His regulations affecting the laity.

Extent. Peckham seems to have sought to touch almost every phase of the religious life of the laity—their formal religious instructions, their reception of the sacraments, their responsibilities regarding the parish equipment, their rights of sanctuary, their confessions, their personal honor, integrity and purity, their proper observance of Sunday, their avoidance of idleness on weekdays, their soundness in the Faith, and their freedom from superstitions. His was an ambitious program, extensive in scope and inclusive in range.

Educational soundness. Peckham relied largely upon quarterly instruction as the formal method of religious education. However great a step forward this may have been over previous practise, it seems inadequate as a method both from its infrequency and also from the character of its presentation, the "Lecture Method".

But it is to be remembered that Peckham's method was being supplemented—perhaps unintentionally, but none the less effectively—by other methods. "Story Telling" was being employed by the Friars. "Dramatization" was utilized in the ceremonies[7] connected with the church services, especially the dramatic elements inherent in the ornate celebration of the mass, by processions of various character, by the ritual acts performed when the sentence of excommunication was read,[8] and by the rudimentary dramatizations on Christmas Day, Ash Wednesday, Palm Sunday, Easter

[7] Cf. Cutts, *Parish Priests and their People,* p. 311.

[8] After the sentence is read, "then the candle is to be thrown down, and the priest is to spit on the ground, and the bells to ring. This . . . is clearly the origin of the form of Commination still said on Ash Wednesday" — Cutts, *op. cit.,* p. 239. Cf. also p. 315.

Day, Whitsunday, and the Rogation Days.[9] "Worship" was an integral part of the life of the Middle Ages to an extent probably unequalled in modern times. "Projects" were undertaken in which it is not improbable that the adults were sometimes assisted by their own children in securing the timber and stone for repairs to the church fabric, in holding parish ales (*scotales*[10]) for the raising of funds for various parish needs, and even in undertaking pilgrimages and crusades. The "Manual Arts" were employed, quite unconsciously but all the more effectively perhaps, whenever banners were to be embroidered, processional crosses made, choir-stalls and rood-screens carved, &c.

Hence the archbishop did not have to provide for the employment of these various methods; they were already being employed quite naturally, even automatically, in the normal course of the regular church life of the laity of that period. It would seem incongruous to find Peckham prescribing "Story-telling" when it was perhaps already being over-done by the Friars,[11] or making special provision for "Dramatization" when it was regularly an integral part of the ritual and ceremony of the church's services in every parish, cathedral and monastery. "Worship" was not the educational problem that it is today—it came quite naturally into the lives of the populace living in the yet undivided catholic church in England. Any criticism of Peckham's method and of its educational soundness must take these facts into consideration. His work was sound, as far as it went. To measure it by the standards of the twentieth century and then to condemn it in the light of educational and psychological knowledge which was then unknown, would be to impose upon it an unwarrantable and anachronistic criterion.

Value for Religious Education: (a) The Constitutions of Lambeth.

It was by his work on behalf of the laity that Peckham made his main contribution to religious education. Whatever may have been the previous legislation on this subject,[12] it seems clear that Peckham felt that adequate religious instruction was not being

---

9 Cf. Cutts, *op. cit.*, pp. 311 and 315.

10 Cf. Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. i, p. 642 (A. D. 1237) and p. 719 (A. D. 1256). See also *Vetus liber archidiaconi eliensis*, p. 220.

11 And perhaps also by the parish priests. See the allusion to the "otiosis fabulis" with which they were embellishing their sermons, occurring in Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. i, p. 693.

12 Cf. "in dominicis diebus, vel in aliis festis" in 1237 (Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. i, p. 642f); and "frequenter" in 1257 (Wilkins, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 731f), as well as the "frequenter" of the Oxford decrees in 1222 (Wilkins, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 594).

given, and that he sought to provide for such instruction both as to its contents, *viz.*, by his Lambeth tract, and as to its regularity, *viz.*, by his quarterly requirement.

At this distance of time, it is difficult to form an accurate estimate of the exact amount of preaching being done in England in the thirteenth century. Opinions vary greatly and the subject is a larger one than that contemplated in this study.

The frequency of sermons may indeed have been somewhat conditioned by the absence of pews or even benches for the congregations to sit on.[13] The laity were restless,[14] and few preachers save the most gifted could have been expected to hold the attention of a congregation which was already tired from "sitting upon their knees".[15] Owst says[16] that the ordinary layman would squat during sermon-time upon the floor-covering, rushes in summer and straw in winter. There is evidence, however, that as early as 1287 regular seats (*sedilia*) were coming into use, at least in the diocese of Exeter.[17]

The testimony of Owst[18] as to preaching in Medieval England is impressive, although it must be remembered that he is dealing primarily not with Peckham's own period (1279-1292) but with the years 1350-1450.

But Owst cites a statute[19] at Lincoln Cathedral in Peckham's own century providing for the delivery of a sermon "ad populum" every Sunday. Despite his recognition of the neglect of preaching in many places, he notes that "special exception certainly must be made for the greater festivals . . . and for the processions of Palm Sunday and Rogationtide, when . . . many would be preaching. But there was one season of the Church's year which easily eclipsed all others in this respect. This was Lent, great season of fast and shrift—still pretty faithfully observed from what one gathers in the sermon literature—when it was intended that there should be daily sermons in all the churches".[20] Owst shows also that formal tracts on the art of preaching became very numerous from the second half of the thirteenth century onwards,[21] unim-

---

13 Peacock in *E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 31, p. ix. Pews would have been awkward obstructions amid the civic and forensic gatherings often held in these edifices.

14 *Ibid.*, p. 9. Cf. also Owst, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

15 *Loc. cit.*

16 *Op. cit., p.* 166.

17 Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 140.

18 Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 5, 21-9, 35-8, 51, 74-5, 91, 125, 132-4, and 293.

19 *Op. cit.*, p. 145, note 6 (with ref.). Cf. also pp. 106 and 156-7.

20 *Ibid.*, p. 146. Cf. the references for the sermon of Sunday afternoons, given on p. 356f.

21 *Ibid.*, p. 314.

peachable witnesses "that there must have been more genuine declamation and less reading of 'homiliaria' than many would have us believe".[22]

In this connection it is interesting to note that John Peckham himself composed a series of sermons, known as the *Collationes de omnibus Dominicis per annum.*[23] But their date is unknown, and it is unlikely that they were written after he became Primate and was beset with the many pressing duties of the archiepiscopal office. Hence they have not been included in this study of Peckham's work as Archbishop. Fabricius[24] and Zawart[25] refer to another sermon-collection by Peckham, perhaps known as the *Sermones Dominicales XXV,* but Martin could not find these[26] and they have been omitted from the bibliography prepared by Kingsford and Little.

Other bishops encouraged preaching also. Grosseteste (1235-1254) "gave directions to his clergy to preach on Sundays, and gave them the heads of their teaching. Quivil (1280-1292) drew up a similar book for his clergy and required every parish to have a copy under penalty of a fine".[27] There are series of sermons by FitzRalph of Armagh and literally hundreds of other writers—some for all the Sundays of the year and some for the great festivals only.[28] It would seem unaccountably foolish for series of sermons for every Sunday to have been prepared if there had been no reasonable probability that they would ever be delivered.

However, part of the significance of Peckham's Constitutions consists in the fact that at his time parish priests were apparently not preaching every Sunday or holy day, and it was a marked advance in actual practice when the Archbishop insisted upon priests giving sound and constructive moral and religious instruction four times a year; and his Constitutions "remained the basis of all future legislation on this subject until the Reformation".[29]

---

[22] *Ibid.,* p. 315f. Note also his reference to "the great preaching revival of the thirteenth century" (*ibid.,* p. 286), and to "the great homiletic revival of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries" (*Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England,* p. 547).

[23] Cf. Kingsford and Little in *Fratris Johannis Pecham etc.,* p. 4; and Martin in *Reg.,* vol. iii, p. lxxvii (introduction).

[24] *Bibliotheca Latina Mediae et Infimae Aetatis* (Hamburgi, 1734-46) liber IX, p. 331.

[25] *The History of Franciscan Preaching and of Franciscan Preachers,* Franciscan Studies No. 7 (New York, 1928), p. 309.

[26] *Reg.,* vol. iii, p. lvii (introduction). Cf. also *ibid.,* vol. iii, p. lvi (introduction).

[27] Cutts, *op. cit.,* p. 215. Cf. Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England,* p. 29, note 3; and *Religious Pieces* (Perry, editor), p. (v).

[28] Cutts, *op. cit.,* p. 224.

[29] Owst, *op. cit.,* p. 145. Cf. also Deanesly, *op. cit.,* pp. 196-199; Gasquet, *Parish Life,* p. 215; and Cutts, *op. cit.,* pp. 202 and 216f. It is to be noted, however,

Peckham has been acclaimed an outstanding figure in what has been called[30] "the Evangelical movement of the thirteenth century"—a movement which resulted in the "vernacular religious renaissance . . . in the North, about the middle of the fourteenth century".[31] In appraising the accuracy of this evaluation, cognizance must be taken of the existence of two conflicting views now being maintained by historians regarding the importance and position of preaching in the later Middle Ages.

On the one hand, Owst terms the Constitutions of Peckham no less than "epoch-making",[32] and declares that "to the question whether the Peckham Constitutions dealing with preaching were faithfully carried out by the clergy, and rigorously enforced by the bishops in succeeding centuries he (Gasquet) replies with an emphatic affirmative: 'I think there is ample evidence that it was'.[33] Elsewhere he repeats: 'in pre-reformation days the people were well instructed in their faith by priests who faithfully discharged their plain duty in this regard'."[34]

On the other hand, Owst is quite aware of the conflicting view of this matter held by others, and he cites Coulton[35] and Deansely[36] as supporters of the view that preaching suffered from a widespread neglect during this very period. Into this controversy[37] it is not necessary to enter: this study does not attempt to establish the thesis that Peckham alone was able to produce a great revival of preaching, but only that a considerable amount of ecclesiastical legislation is directly traceable to his Constitutions and that a large number of clerical manuals show traces of his exposition of Christian doctrine as embodied in the Lambeth Constitutions.

Even Deanesly can be quoted as acknowledging that Peckham made great efforts to improve the character and position of preach-

---

that Dalton believes that sermons were delivered every *die solis* and that the instructions prescribed by the Lambeth decrees were given in addition to them, *i. e.*, "besides these usual Sunday sermons;" see *The Collegiate Church of Ottery St. Mary* (Cambridge University Press, 1917), p. 102 and the additional references there given.

30 Cotton, Charles, *The Grey Friars of Canterbury,* p. x.

31 Owst, *op. cit.,* p. 230. Cf. *ibid.,* p. 296.

32 *Ibid.,* p. 8.

33 *The Old English Bible,* &c, pp. 187-8.

34 Owst, *op. cit.,* pp. 25-6.

35 *Mediaeval Studies,* First Series, Appendix I. (second edition).

36 *The Lollard Bible.*

37 See Thurston, *Some Inexactitudes of Mr. G. G. Coulton* (London, 1927); and Coulton, *Medieval Studies* (First Series), Appendix I (pp. 79-126), which claims to give "nearly 200 blunders" found in Gasquet's books; and *Medieval Studies* (Second Series), Appendix to Study VIII. "Parish Life in Medieval England," reprinted from *The Churchman,* April, 1907.

ing in his day. After alluding to Grosseteste's emphasis upon popular preaching, Deanesly[38] continues: "Archbishop Peckham, himself a Franciscan and full of the traditions of his order, made great efforts also to improve clerical education, and the sermons of parish priests. In a letter to the bishop of Tusculum, dated 1284, he lamented over the frequent appointments of un-preaching bishops, as elsewhere over the ignorance of the clergy. He described in this letter the seven chief abuses of the Church of his day: the sixth is the 'vilipensio Evangelicarum', or small esteem in which the contents of the gospels are held.

> "For according to the doctrine of saints, a bishop's office consists chiefly in the doctrine of the Word of God, whence the episcopal order is called by the holy Fathers, the 'order of preachers': yet in celebrating elections or conferring dignities, no mention is made of the office of preaching; and since in this respect no question is asked as to what the gospels say, but as to what the common gloss clamoureth, the commandments of God are made of none effect for the traditions of men . . . ."[39]

He himself nevertheless continued the study of the scriptures, says Deanesly,[40] and "we have in 1283 a correspondence between him and the provincial of the friars preacher, who have, he declares, unjustly detained a Vulgate worth 113 marks (or over 1000 pounds modern money), which he exhorts them to return."[41]

In any consideration of the influence of Archbishop Peckham's Constitutions allusion must be made to a very knotty question in English Canon Law: What actual authority did provincial constitutions possess? This question is but part of a wider problem for canonists, *viz.*, What authority did any purely national Canon Law possess in England? On this subject very divergent views have been held by eminent canonists. Stubbs, Maitland, and Ogle have brilliantly expounded the results of their researches and have reached conclusions which seem to be quite irreconcilable.[42] The present writer is aware that only experts in ecclesiastical jurisprudence have any right to speak on such moot questions as these, and merely notes the position maintained by Ogle in his spirited refutation[43] of Maitland's views:

> "He (Maitland) hesitates, in his goodness, to place the Constitutions of Peckham and Winchelsey beside the statutes of Edward

---

38 *Op. cit.*, p. 184.

39 *Reg.*, p. 696.

40 *Loc. cit.*

41 *Reg.*, p. 542.

42 All three views may be found in Ogle, A., *The Canon Law in Mediaeval England* (London: John Murray, 1912).

43 *Op. cit.*, pp. 109-144 *et passim.*

I.; yet nothing is more certain than that the subjects of Edward I. would have had no such pitying hesitation. For them the statutes of the Primates in Convocation and of the Sovereign in Parliament possessed, in their respective spheres, an equal moral and legal authority. In their minds the Provincial Constitutions were not bye-laws, but the law; of them, as the law, they habitually thought; to them they habitually appealed. It was, to them, the law of Holy Church, as their own Church had had occasion to enact it."[44]

Constitutions passed in synods were to be published yearly in the ruridecanal chapter meetings and were to be learned by heart by the parish priests.[45] As to the degree to which they might possess binding force there would naturally be fluctuations according to the spirit of the times. It is not surprising to find that canons and constitutions amounted to little more than impressive exhortations at periods when the episcopal disciplinary system was disrupted by state interference and papal exemptions.

Value for religious education: (b) Other constructive measures.

Peckham's requirements regarding the Viaticum were calculated to render more effective the ministrations of the church in the intimate life of the laity and thus to intensify the religious education which the church's program inherently provided. While proposing no new instrumentality for the church to use in its work, he promoted the educational means already at hand, *viz.*, the sacraments, especially baptism, confirmation, the Eucharist and penance. He enhanced particularly the effectiveness of the dramatic character (and thus the teaching power) of the rites connected with the Sacrament of the Altar, the proper reverence with which it was to be reserved and the ceremony with which it was to be carried to the sick.

He made it clear to the laity what were their responsibilities regarding the equipment of the parish and he kept them in close touch with the "ornaments" needed for the ornate worship of the church. This tended to keep holy things constantly in the thoughts of the laity, as did also his provision that the church bell should be rung at the elevation of the host.

The Primate was a sturdy champion for the preservation of the "Right of Sanctuary" which consecrated churches offered to the laity. This privilege of immunity from the vengeance of the mob or of the secular arm was of questionable value, however, and was likely to be abused by fraudulent debtors.[46] It "was no real gain

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 113f. See also Appendix II of this study.
[45] See Capes, *op. cit.*, pp. 241 and 259.
[46] Capes, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

to the interests of the church",[47] and its value for religious education was probably nil or even negative. It would seem that such a privilege would tend to encourage crime,[48] and that it would seriously militate against efforts to develop a socialized type of character.

The Archbishop's insistence upon the right of the Friars to hear the confessions of the laity amounted to official encouragement of the laity to go to the Friars to make their confessions. This aspect of Peckham's work must also be regarded as being of questionable educational value. The employment of friars as confessors entailed many ramifications and implications possessing significance for religious education. Advantages and disadvantages of this practice have been ably summarized by Little[49] as follows:—

> "Confession to a friar whom a penitent sees perhaps once a year or may never see again, is easier than confession to a parish priest whom he sees daily, but far less morally efficacious; for the penitent does not feel the same shame for his sin and need of amendment. . . . The parish priest loses touch with his people and his authority is undermined . . . . The friars, sometimes through ignorance, sometimes to curry favour with the rich, grant absolution on easy terms: thus the confessional is made an avenue to sin. . . . Alms which ought to go to the maintenance of parish churches, roads, and bridges are diverted to the houses of friars. . . .
>
> "Many secular priests were morally and intellectually unsuitable. The negligence or ignorance of the parish priests was perhaps the chief and most widely applicable argument brought forward on behalf of the friars. Auricular confession only became general and compulsory after the Lateran Council of 1215, and clergy so far had very little professional education. . . . It is probable that compulsory auricular confession would never have been enforced without the friars. A light penance which people would perform was better than a heavy one which they would not. Many persons refused altogether to confess to their parish priests. Given the policy of the Church, it was better that the lead in carrying it out should be taken by men who made a careful study of the questions involved."

A large number of handbooks on confession and penance appeared in the thirteenth century; the authors of these, as far as they can now be identified, were mostly Mendicant Friars. Peckham himself compiled such a work, known as the *Formula Confessionum* [50] in which he appeals directly to the individual conscience of the layman. At its beginning, Peckham makes the penitent de-

---

47 *Ibid.*, p. 269.

48 The rights of sanctuary were curtailed *c.* 1379. See *ibid.*, pp. 133 and 203.

49 In *Studies in English Franciscan History*, pp. 116f. [With permission of the Manchester University Press.]

50 *Ibid.*, p. 121.

cide for himself whether his act is sinful or not, insisting that the penitent should confess "only those sins of which his own conscience accuses him". Mr. Little believes that in matters pertaining to confession and penance the friars really instructed the seculars, and in this work Peckham played a part with his own handbook, the *Formula Confessionum,* which is described as being particularly rich in "memoria technica" lines.[51] The date of this work by Peckham seems to be unknown and perhaps can never be fixed with certainty. It seems reasonable to believe that it was composed before he undertook the arduous duties of the primacy, and so it has not been accorded extensive consideration in this present study.[52]

When Peckham taught respect for a pledged word and combatted avarice and usury, he was definitely engaging in Moral Education. It can hardly be maintained that this signalized any revolutionary advance in religious education; but it shows the broad conception of character which Peckham held, one which was not limited to church attendance and outward conformity to ecclesiastical regulations, but one which included ethical conduct in everyday life.

There is some significance for religious education in the fact that the Primate preached a Crusade: "and many magnates of England assumed the cross".[53] Here we have a record of the results: he actually induced many of the substantial personages of the realm to put religion first in their own lives and to give themselves to the arduous and ultimately futile attempt to dislodge the Saracen from the Holy Land. Thoughts of crusaders and their exploits filled the minds of thousands in the Middle Ages and formed a subtle part of the religious education of the laity for many years. It is therefore worthy of note that Peckham lent his influence to keeping this element alive and operative in the religious education of that time.

Indulgences were also an element in the religious lives of the people of Peckham's day. They may not have promoted the advancement of religious education of a high type—they may even have retarded it. Peckham granted indulgences and thus lent the weight of his official influence to this system which the church in

---

[51] *Ibid.,* p. 120, note 1.

[52] The same reason accounts for the similar omission of any extended reference to his *Collectanea Bibliorum,* printed in 1513, 1514, and 1541 as *Divinarum Sententiarum Librorum Biblie ad certos titulos redacte Collectarium,* a "collection of biblical texts under various heads: De contemptu Mundi, Contra Superbiam prelatorum, etc."—See *Fr. Johannis Pecham . . . Tractatus tres de Paupertate,* p. 3.

[53] Bartholomaeus de Cotton, *Hist. Angl.,* p. 177.

England later discarded. Some of his indulgences contained definite teaching—even though by some it might be termed mariolatrous teaching—and so played a part at least in molding the general form and content of the religious education which the laity were receiving from the church. Probably these indulgences must be checked up against the archbishop's record as having been injurious to the highest development of religious education.

The number of Welsh children who were sent to England for their education as the result of Peckham's urgent pleas is unknown; but whatever children were thus educated in England evidently had better opportunities for religious education than those which Wales was at that time providing. They were thus brought into contact with the catholic church at a higher stage of development than that to be found in Wales, and their religious education was therefore superior in content and presentation to what would otherwise have been the case.

Damaged houses of worship are poor advertisements for any church, and the Primate wanted the church to appear so fine and stately that it would command the veneration and esteem of the populace. His efforts to have the Welsh churches rebuilt were therefore likely to promote the church's influence over the lives of the Welsh people, with the ensuing consequence of a heightened effectiveness in the religious education which such churches could give.

Value for religious education: (c) Restrictive and disciplinary measures.

Of an equally conjectural character are the results of Peckham's efforts to promote the proper observance of Sunday. This does not, however, preclude the placing of an estimate upon the importance to religious education of these efforts. They clearly served to uphold the sanctity of the Fourth Commandment and to secure more time for the due worship of God throughout the entire diocese of Canterbury. God was to be given His rightful place in the lives of thousands; His divine law was to be more properly observed; and His divine church was to be more respectfully treated. Less work, more praying; curtailed secular occupations, more worship. Such emphases could not have failed to possess significant value for religious education.

That the archbishop penalized with great severity the sins of fornication and adultery emphasized the sanctity of the Seventh Commandment and proved that in Peckham's mind religious education was to include purity of living. His characteristically severe provision for the excommunication of unruly scholars at the Can-

terbury school shows the high position which he accorded to obedience, a virtue which Peckham ever valiantly championed.

In his condemnation of idleness, Peckham touched upon a matter of grave concern in any program of character education. To remedy the alarming conditions then existent in Wales, the primate prescribed daily manual labor—a most salutary procedure from the standpoint of the psychology of character education. His injunctions, if carried out, probably produced a change for the better, one in which conditions were more conducive to moral development and ethical advance in many an isolated community.

It is always of definite value to religion to have the air cleared of pagan superstition and of visionary tales. Peckham may well have helped the cause of religious education by his attack upon the superstitions in Wales at that time. Perhaps his labors bore no apparent fruit; but he showed that the Church did not countenance fables.[54]

Summary. From the foregoing data it seems clear that Peckham's work was strongest where it affected the laity and weakest where it touched the monasteries. As a Friar, he may have been prejudiced[55] against the Monastics to an extent sufficient to cause him to adopt inadequate methods of dealing with the monasteries and also to apply these methods awkwardly, woodenly and tactlessly, relying more upon the prerogatives of his official position than upon the possible effectiveness of conference and persuasion. In brief, the archbishop's educational work with the monasteries was designed to make the religious education which they supplied more effective because provided under conditions permeated by higher ethical standards.

His work with the seculars tended to promote greater personal purity of life, more attention to pastoral care and to preaching, together with increased reverence in the conduct of the services of the church.

His reforms at Oxford probably possessed no enduring significance for religious education.

His labors on behalf of the religious education of the laity were of a wide and enduring nature, and were based upon fairly sound educational principles. His program of moral and religious education indicated a broad and social conception of character. He stands upon the pages of history as the promulgator of the "epoch-

[54] For various conciliar actions against magic and pagan practices, see Collins, R. W., "The Parish Priest and his Flock as Depicted in the Councils of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries", in *Journal of Religion,* X (1930), p. 331f.

[55] Cf. *Reg.,* p. 726.

making"[56] Constitutions of Lambeth and as a leader in the evangelical revival of the later Middle Ages.[57]

Yet in all his work, Peckham was neither an innovator nor an originator. His efforts were almost wholly directed toward the tightening up of existing decrees, toward the increasing of the effectiveness of their execution, and toward securing a stricter[58] observation of their provisions. His one original contribution seems to have been his definite requirement as to precisely what religious instruction was to be given to the laity, and that this definite body of religious material was to be presented once a quarter. Even here there was the precedent of the quarterly reading of the sentences of excommunication and also a considerable body of previous ecclesiastical legislation, the extent of which has already been indicated.[59]

---

[56] See Owst, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
[57] See Cotton, C., *op. cit.*, p. x; and Owst, *op. cit.*, p. 230.
[58] Cf. "Frater Joannes, Cantuariensis archiepiscopus . . . imposuit, ut statuta generalis concilii facerent artius observari"—Trivet, *Annales*, p. 301.
[59] In the section on Peckham's Relation to Preceding Legislation &c.

IX

APPRAISAL OF PECKHAM'S INFLUENCE

1. On later Ecclesiastical Legislation

Extent. It seems reasonable to conclude from the data here presented that Quivil, Grandisson, Thoresby, Langham, Wykeham, Arundel, Stafford, Neville and others put forth ecclesiastical legislation which bore the stamp of the certain or probable influence of Archbishop Peckham. Since Langham,[1] Arundel and Stafford filled the primatial see of Canterbury, and since Thoresby and Neville occupied that of York (with Quivil and Grandisson filling Exeter, and Wykeham holding Winchester), it follows that Peckham's influence extended over the whole of England.

Effectiveness. Documentary evidence of the effectiveness of Peckham's decrees would hardly be expected to exist in forms which would mention him by name. His immediate successors frequently took a hand in the same matters which had received his own notice, and their successors were but little concerned to mention explicitly the name of any prelate in connection with legislation enacted long before their own time. In the nature of the case, therefore, Peckham's actual influence would seldom be acknowledged in the official text of later legislation.[2]

There are extant inventories,[3] however, showing that the *Statuta synodalia* were being kept "in a considerable number of the churches in the archdeaconry" of Ely,[4] drawn up for the guidance of the parish clergy, based on previous provincial and legatine decisions of the thirteenth century, and modeled very closely upon the *Statuta synodalia* of Norwich.[5] The editors believe that the *Vetus Liber* was compiled in consequence of Archbishop Peckham's injunctions given at his visitation in 1277,[6] and that his legislation is included in that which formed the basis of the *Statuta synodalia*

---

1 Langham was bishop of Ely at the time of the promulgation of the injunctions similar to Peckham's; but this (1364) was only two years prior to his translation to Canterbury (1366). There is no reason to believe that he changed his views as to religious education when he became Primate.

2 It was probably Peckham's own requirement regarding generosity to the poor which was promulgated in the diocese of Exeter by Bishop Quivil in 1281. See Cutts, *op. cit.*, p. 326, note.

3 Preserved in the *Vetus liber archidiaconi eliensis,* pp. 30-148.

4 *Ibid.,* p. 215f.

5 Promulgated about 1257.

6 *Op. cit.,* p. xxxiii.

found in the various churches whose inventories are given in that book.[7]

Peckham's injunctions relative to clerical habit could not have been particularly effective, for about fifty years later, i. e., in the Constitutions of Archbishop Stratford in 1342,[8] there is a lament that the clergy were defying the canonical regulations respecting their distinctive garb, and that the abuses were prevailing "more than usual in these days".[9]

On the other hand, Peckham's emphasis upon systematic religious instruction made itself definitely felt immediately, in the opinion of Capes. He says:—

> "That there was early in the fourteenth century real and continuous instruction in the parish churches we may fairly assume from the answers which were given to the inquiries made by the Cathedral Chapter at the visitations of their churches in the diocese of Exeter. In each parish questions seem to have been asked about the parson's character and conduct, and the reply sent in by representative parishioners was commonly that he preached well and thoroughly, or that he gave adequate instruction to his people."[10]

While Owst, too, has presented many data[11] suggestive of a similar conclusion, he has also cited evidence[12] that the Peckham decrees "were not being properly observed",[13] although it is to be noted that some of his evidence relates to a very much later date.[14] By 1434, the reading of the "Great sentence" had become so infrequent that a council at Canterbury revived its reading "at least on three Sundays in the year", and the following year this requirement was re-iterated by Bishop Stafford in his own diocese.[15]

2. His Influence on Clerical Manuals.

Extent. Deanesly[16] and Owst[17] have attributed a very wide range

---

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 215f.

[8] Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. ii, p. 703f.

[9] Cutts, *op. cit.*, p. 164f. Cf. "clericorum abusus, qui plus solito invaluit his diebus, in tonsuris, vestibus, et ornamentis equorum, ac aliis, abominabile scandalum in populo generavit"—Wilkins, *loc. cit.* This Lambeth constitution had been repeated already by Bishop Gilbert of Chichester in 1289, and by the Council of Ripon in 1306. See *ibid.*, pp. 169f. and 285.

[10] Capes, *op. cit.*, p. 256f. Some of these returns are given rather fully by Cutts, *op. cit.*, pp. 285-9.

[11] Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 62, 66, 145f., 314-6.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 46.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 146.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 25f. and p. 29.

[15] Stafford's Register (T. S. Holmes, editor), vol. ii, p. 170f. Owst, *op. cit.*, p. 359, gives further information and references.

[16] *The Lollard Bible,* p. 216f. and *passim.*

[17] *Preaching in Medieval England,* pp. 8, 145, 282f., 296f., etc.

to the extent of Peckham's influence upon all pre-Wycliffite clerical manuals without attempting to specify in any great detail or with much exactness the precise limits of the Primate's influence. This present study has attempted to discover in fuller detail and to exhibit more precisely the exact extent of the archbishop's influence upon these manuals; and from the evidence here presented it would seem that there is still extant clear and explicit proof of Peckham's influence upon the *Pupilla Oculi,* the *Speculum Christiani,* the *Flos Florum,* the *Regimen Animarum,* MS. Lambeth 460, *Jacob's Well,* Byrde's *Speculum Christiani,* the *Exornatorium Curatorum* (or MS. Lansdowne 379), and MS. Merton 217.

It would seem highly probable that Peckham's influence can also be seen in the *Oculus Sacerdotum* (including the *Cilium Oculi Sacerdotis*), the *Compilatio Brevis,* MS. Add. 24660, MS. Bod. 110, Myrc's *Manuale Sacerdotum* and his *Instructions for Parish Priests,* the *Lay Folks' Catechism* (including the *Speculum Vitae Christianiae*), and its Lollard adaptation.

It would seem possible that there are traces of his influence also in the *Quatuor Sermones,* in MS. Cambr. Dd. XII, 69, in MS. Linc. Cath. Libr. A. 6. 2, and in other[18] manuscripts.

This collection of data comprises a ponderable number of actual cases—at least a score in all. In nine of these instances Peckham's influence is demonstrable; in eight other instances it is highly probable; and in still others it is quite possible. Although this enumeration does not extend to the Primate any cavalier magnanimity in the evaluation of his importance, it seems to constitute a distinct clarification of the actual extent of his influence upon clerical manuals.

It does not fall within the province of this study to enter, in any great detail, into the technical question of the literary interrelationships between these various manuals,[19] a question pertaining rather to the history of literature than to "Peckham as a Religious Educator". It is sufficient here to state that eminent scholars such as Deanesly acknowledge Peckham's influence in determining the general outline and scope of these manuals; that these manuals existed in considerable numbers; and that they were regarded with such esteem that they were mentioned by name in various wills. Deanesly cites instances of the bequeathing of the

---

[18] E. g., MS. Cambr. Dd. IX, 38, MS. Harl. 2349, f. 114, and MS. Roy. 18. B. xxiii, all of which would perhaps reward investigation. See also the list given by Martin in *Reg.,* vol. iii, p. cxxxii and ff., to which should be added pp. 409-424 of the volume containing the (Carlisle) registers of Bishops Welton (1353-1362) and Appleby (1363-1395).

[19] See Wells, *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050–1400.*

Oculus Sacerdotis[20] and of the *Pupilla Oculi*[21]—particularly significant when it is recalled that "the wills of parish priests before Wycliffe's death are relatively few, because it was not until about 1400 that persons with relatively little to leave made wills at all".[22] In the wills of lay people, however, the *Book of the Vices and Virtues* is often mentioned.[23] It appeared about 1400, and was a midland version of the *Ayenbite of Inwyt, a translation* from a French original into Kentish prose of instruction on those subjects which all medieval councils and teachers deemed necessary for the laity, *viz.*, the Ten Commandments, the Creed (in twelve sections), the Seven Deadly Sins, the Six Sins against the Holy Ghost, &c., with twenty pages devoted to the *Pater Noster.*

It is quite impossible to estimate exactly the amount of the influence of Peckham upon the *Ayenbite of Inwyt,* for it may be a translation of the *Somme des Vices et des Vertues,* or the *Somme le Roi,* dating from about 1279 and translated from the *Summae de Viciis et Virtutibus* written by Guil. Peraldus (Perrault) about 1260, thus antedating by a score of years Peckham's Lambeth Constitutions.

Richard Rolle (*c.* 1340) wrote a guide to confession, *De Modo Confitendi* and perhaps also *"A Form of Confession"* preserved in the Southern MS. Vernon f. 366. Of this latter Wells says:[24]

> "First is a detailed confession item by item of guilt of each of the Seven Sins, of breaking of each Commandment, of failure to fulfil any of the Deeds of Mercy, of evil use of each of the Senses. This is followed by a catechism with questions and answers, on the Commandments, the Deadly Sins, the Senses, the Works of Mercy, and the Cardinal Virtues."

This material is strikingly similar to the "Peckham-Thoresby Outline of Instruction", and it would be interesting to know whether Rolle was directly influenced either by Peckham's Decrees or by his *Formula Confessionum;* but works of this sort were not rare,[25] and they must be included only among the possible but unproved traces of Peckham's influence. The same must be said of William of Shoreham's lyrical poems—on the Seven Sacraments, on the Ten Commandments, on the Seven Deadly Sins, &c.[26] If, as Wells

---

20 *Op. cit.,* p. 202, note 1.

21 *Loc. cit.,* note 3. Cf. also *ibid.,* pp. 391-8; and Appendix I, 6: "Analysis of 7578 wills made before 1526, &c."

22 Deanesly, *op. cit.,* p. 203.

23 Deanesly, *op. cit.,* p. 214.

24 *Op. cit.,* p. 360.

25 See Wells, *loc. cit.*

suggests,[27] this was the same William of Shoreham whom Archbishop Peckham ordained acolyte at Croydon in 1287[28] some direct influence of Peckham's standard of minimal knowledge as promulgated at Lambeth might not be improbable.

The Abbey of the Holy Ghost, of unknown authorship and of unknown date,[29] contains a passage, near the end, where four evil damsels, Envy, Pride, Grumbling, and Evil Thinking, are introduced into the abbey. This may or may not be a reverberation of Peckham's list of vices.

The author of the *Speculum Laicorum,* probably a Franciscan,[30] quotes a couplet by Peckham, but the lines[31] have little significance save as indicating that Peckham was being quoted even during his life-time.[32] This *Speculum* was a clerical manual of the type known as *Exemplaria,* and contains chapters on avarice, envy, vanity, haughtiness, and other vices, arranged alphabetically and somewhat suggestive of Peckham's emphasis upon the vices to be shunned. But the archbishop is quoted only in a chapter of a very different character, *viz.,* Caput LXIX: De prelatorum statu. Hence any connection with the Constitutions of Lambeth is purely hypothetical.

Effectiveness. These clerical manuals seem to have been the main (and almost the only) books on Pastoral Care which were available for the use of the clergy. Hence a large proportion of whatever influence the clergy had upon their people would be traceable, at least in part, to the guidance and instruction provided by these manuals.

3. Curricula, &c.

Extent. There seems to be trace of only one school (Childrey, Berks) having a prescribed curriculum apparently molded on the lines of the Peckham outline of Faith.

Peckham's injunctions requiring Confirmation as a pre-requisite to the reception of the Holy Communion possessed binding authority and were legally effective throughout the entire province

---

[26] For fuller treatment, see Wells, *op. cit.,* pp. 349f. and 817.

[27] *Ibid.,* Second Supplement, p. 1061.

[28] *Reg.,* p. 1046. See another (?) William of Shoreham, *ibid.,* p. 1018.

[29] In *Religious Pieces* (George C. Perry, editor) *E. E. T. S.* (O. S.) 26, part 2. Its prologue refers to the whole "Peckham Program." See Deanesly, *op. cit.,* p. 199.

[30] See Welter, *Le Speculum Laicorum,* p. viii. Also Davis, H. W. C., editor, *Medieval England,* p. 404.

[31] *Ibid.,* p. 90.

[32] *Ibid.,* pp. vi-vii.

of Canterbury. Indirectly, this requirement has resulted in Anglican children receiving the formal religious instruction contained in the Prayer Book Catechism since 1549. The number of persons who have received this instruction now amounts to many millions scattered throughout the broad extent of the Anglican Communion.

Effectiveness. However reluctant the Church may have been to accord to Confirmation the position which Peckham decreed that it should occupy, nevertheless the laity finally accepted the standard which the Primate had upheld and ultimately ecclesiastical practise concurred with his requirement. This canonical provision has remained the law of the Anglican Church ever since that time.

Summary. From the foregoing data it seems clear that the archbishop's influence extended well into the sixteenth century, as proved by the long catena of legislative acts put forth by the Church re-enforcing Peckham's earlier requirements, and by the continual appearance of clerical manuals bearing the stamp of his influence. From the Wolsey and Longland decrees and from the publication in 1532 of the *Exornatorium Curatorum* it seems clear that his influence lasted until the Reformation. In a wider sense, to whatever degree the *Prayer Book* requirements of learning a Catechism before being confirmed and of being confirmed before receiving the Holy Communion can be traced to requirements based upon the ancient Lambeth decrees, to that degree Peckham's influence continues to the present day.

* * * *

It would seem reasonable to accept this collection of documentary evidence as sufficient to warrant the conclusion that Peckham exerted a very real influence for over two hundred years, if it were not for the fact "Canon Law is not history",[33] and for the fact that the frequent repetition of these decrees may after all be but evidence of the *futility* of the legislation on this subject.[34]

In other words, the data which have been assembled and presented in this study *may* indicate that Peckham's influence was still very real and potent; on the other hand, they *may* indicate that Peckham's influence had so completely waned that similar and oft-repeated measures were being required to achieve the very things that his decrees had aimed to accomplish. As Coulton says:[35]

---

[33] Coulton, *Medieval Studies*: First Series (Second revised edition, with 3 Appendices), p. 122.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 103.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 73 Cf. p. 74f.

"Surely common sense would suggest that the very repetition and emphasis of such injunctions pointed to something wrong in practice"; and "it is a well-known canon of historical evidence that this wearisome reiteration on the part of law-givers is usually an indication not of general obedience, but of general disobedience to the command so reiterated".[36] Speaking of the "despairing words of Peckham" with which the Lambeth tract opens,[37] Coulton says that Peckham's accusation against his clergy was repeated (explicitly or implicitly) by nearly all the wearily repeated injunctions about pulpit preaching throughout the Middle Ages.[38]

"For this legislation of 1281 was that on which succeeding medieval injunctions were based; Cardinal Gasquet himself points out that 'the constitutions of Peckham are referred to constantly in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as the foundation of the existing practices in the English Church.' But he takes good care *not* to point out that Peckham's damning preamble, *Ignorantia Sacerdotum,* was echoed also down the centuries to the very Reformation period. Even in 1518, we find Cardinal Wolsey proclaiming in full synod to his Province of York 'the ignorance of the priests casteth people into the ditch' etc., etc., down to the last word of Peckham's arraignment.[39] Wolsey, in short, takes care to emphasize all those facts which the Cardinal now so laboriously conceals from his readers; all those facts which would compel us to amend his phrase 'existing *practices*' into 'existing *theories*'. For Wolsey, in his own individual preamble, specially excuses himself for now republishing so many time-worn constitutions, on the ground that *they had not been kept in the past* (Wilkins, vol. III, p. 662). . . . The theory that priests should teach their flocks from the pulpit, at least four times a year, was as partially realized as most other medieval theories".[40]

* * * *

Peckham differed from the more spectacular reformers of a later age by seeking to correct abuses quietly rather than by at-

---

[36] *Ibid.,* p. 103.

[37] *I. e., Ignorantia sacerdotum* etc.

[38] *Op. cit.,* p. 104.

[39] See Wilkins, *Concilia,* vol. iii, pp. 662-675.

[40] Coulton, *Medieval Studies* (First Series), p. 104. Cf. also the statement by Dr. John Bromyard, eminent Dominican preacher, expert in Canon Law, and Chancellor of Cambridge, less than a century after Peckham, that "well-nigh every non-lucrative Decretal and Constitution of the Church is made but to be broken," quoted by Owst, G. R., *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England* (Cambridge: University Press, 1933), p. 480 (and *ibid.,* p. 252), from Bromyard's *Summa Predicantium, s. v.* "Mandata."

tempting to alter radically the existing machinery of the Holy Roman Church. Perhaps the obstacles to such a reformation as he contemplated were wholly insuperable in the thirteenth century, a century when rulers of extraordinary genius sat upon the papal throne and when the power and prestige of pope and legate were at their height. In any case, Peckham probably went as far in his efforts at reform and education as any loyal papalist could wisely venture, and after the lapse of six hundred years the verdict of the twentieth century is rightly coming to be that voiced by Lampen:[41] "Jean Peckam, le grand docteur parisien, Maître du Sacré Palais, ensuite Primat d'Angleterre, est encore trop peu estimé, au moins hors de sa patrie",[42] supplemented by the conviction that Peckham is justly entitled to that "lumière plus brillante"[43] which is now slowly and tardily being accorded him.[44] In his labors as a religious educator, this Friar-Archbishop epitomizes for the church in England, with striking fidelity, the entire period between Grosseteste and the Reformation.

---

41 *Op. cit.,* p. 211. (A. D. 1928.)

42 Quoting Oliger's "Magnus ille Doctor Parisiensis, Sacri Palatii Magister et demum Primas Angliae, pro momento suo nondum satis existimetur, praeterquam forsan in patria sua Anglia"—*Archivum Franciscanum Historicum,* vol. iv (1911), p. 147.

43 Lampen, *loc. cit.*

44 Note, for example, the position recently accorded him by D. E. Sharp, in *Franciscan Philosophy at Oxford in the Thirteenth Century,* pp. 175-207 *et passim.*

APPENDIX I

Variant Spellings of Peckham's Name

Patcham	Peckam
Peachamus	Peckham
Pecanus	Pectzan
Peccanus	Pecziano
Peccham	Pehão
Peccheham	P(e)kam
Pecciano	Pekham
Pech	Pesch
Pecham	Pescham
Pechame	Peschan(t)
Pechamo	Petham
Pechano	Pethcham
Pecheham	Petsan
Pechiano	Picciano
Pechham	Piccianor

Fr. Dr. Willibrord Lampen, O. F. M., says, "L'orthographe du nom Pecham montre la variété la plus grande", and he includes even Pecranus, Betsan, and Checcano in his list. See his *Jean Pecham, O. F. M., et son Office de la S. Trinité,* in "La France Franciscaine", tome XI (1928), p. 211. For other comments on the orthography of the name, see P. Hieronymus Spettmann, O. F. M., "Quellenkritisches zur Biographie des Johannes Pecham", in *Franziskanische Studien,* ii (1915), 170.

APPENDIX II

The "Ecclesia Anglicana"

A NOTE ON ITS ALLEGED INDEPENDENCE

Into the knotty problem of the degree of independence enjoyed by the *ecclesia Anglicana* the writer is not inclined to enter. In this vexed question there is need of much precision in the terminology employed: independent of whom? independent in what respects? independent in theory or in practice? independent within what limits?

The writer is not in sympathy with such extreme assertions as, for example, that by the Rt. Rev. H. T. Kingdon when he states: "Here we must remember the perfect independence of the Church of England. Her very name shows her independence. . . . She always had her own laws; and the Canon law of the Continent of Europe never obtained in England except so far as the Church of England adopted and incorporated such canons as were regarded as suitable".[1] Perhaps this statement might be taken as representative of the older view as championed by Stubbs. Too much scholarly evidence, largely from manuscripts, has been recently produced by Brooke[2] to permit such a view to remain unmodified.

But, on the other hand, the present writer notes that Brooke admits that the *ecclesia Anglicana* "had a certain definite unity of its own", although this unity "was of a secular and not of an ecclesiastical character"[3]; and he declines to overlook such other evidence as Lyndwood's:—*"Ecclesiae Anglicanae.* Quae in sui totalitate quandam Universitatem importat respectu suiipsius: & sic ejus libertas potest dici Universalis, licet in aliquibus differat à libertate Ecclesiae generaliter Universalis, secundum ea quae dixi *supra*".[4] Lacey states that the phrase "quandam Universitatem" implies that the two provinces were "in effect an incorporated unit".[5]

A judicious position in this matter seems to be maintained by Patterson[6]. On the one hand, he states: "Bishops and abbots, in the struggle of Anselm against William II, seemed to half-believe in the independence of the national church"[7]; "the feeling of the English Church was insular and national"[8]; depicting Grosseteste as a "nationalist leader

---

1 *The Reformation Period,* p. 170. In "The Church in the British Isles", (five contributors), being the *Church Club Lectures for* 1889 (New York: E. & J. B. Young & Co., *ca.* 1892).

2 Brooke, Z. N., *The English Church and the Papacy from the Conquest to the Reign of John* (Cambridge, 1931). Its freedom was "freedom from royal control and at the same time freedom to obey the Pope" (page 10. Cf. also pp. 17, 18, 20, 99, 105, 113, 175-90, 209, 212, and 226f).

3 *Ibid.,* p. 22.

4 *Provinciale* (Oxoniae, 1679), Lib. iii, tit. 28; p. 266.

5 Lacey, T. A., *Unity and Schism* (London & Milwaukee: Mowbray, 1917), p. 43.

6 *A History of the Church of England* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1920).

7 *Op. cit.,* p. 89.

8 *Ibid.,* p. 113.

against papal encroachments"[9]. On the other hand, Patterson admits the defeat of the older theory:—

> "There was a theory popular some little time ago, and backed by the authority of great names, which maintained that the Church of England during the Middle Ages was, relatively speaking, a national antipapal Church. But this theory in the light of fuller investigation must be altogether discarded. The medieval Church of England was *papalissima*. By the old theory it was maintained that the Church of England in its convocations felt itself free to pick and choose among the canons of the Western Church, to choose one and reject another. . . . This view would seem to be quite mistaken".[10]

He also acknowledges that the English Church "was brought more under papal influence after 1066"[11], and that "the papal Curia became the court of final appeal for the whole of Latin Christendom".[12] It seems well to admit that "in its essence the Church was international",[13] and the present writer is far from regarding the portion existing in England as an independent spiritual entity.

---

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 143.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 176.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 62.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 93.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 144. But note also Powicke, F. M., *Medieval England 1066-1485* (London, 1931): "the local, almost patriotic note in the phrase, *ecclesia Anglicana* as it was used, to take one obvious example, by the good Benedictine monk, the chronicler Matthew Paris."—pp. 126-7.

Bibliography

BIBLIOGRAPHY (abridged)

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

Manuscripts:—

Add. 24660.
Burney 356.....Flos Florum
Cotton Galba E. iv. folios 61-5. (Examined from rotostats)
Harl. 2272.....Regimen Animarum
Harl. 6580.....Byrd's translation of the *Speculum Christiani*
Lansdowne 379.....Exornatorium Curatorum
Roy. 18. B. xxiii.

Cambr. Univ. Libr. Dd. XII. 69.
Cambr. Univ. Libr. Ff. 1. 18.....Compilatio brevis

Lambeth 460.

Merton 217.

Other primary sources[1]:—

Burgh (or Burgo), John de: Pupilla Oculi. (London). 1510.

Peckham, John: Fratris Johannis Pecham . . . . Tractatus tres de paupertate . . . cum bibliographia. Kingsford, C. L., Little, A. G., and Tocco, F., editors. (Brit. Soc. Franc. Stud., vol. ii.) Aberdoniae. 1910.

.... Philomena. [Latin and English]. William Dobell, translator. London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., 1924.

.... [Registrum] Diœcesis Cantuariensis: Pars Prima (1908) and Pars Secunda (1910). *Canterbury and York Series,* Part xiv (1908) and Part xxii (1910). London: Canterbury and York Society, 1908 and 1910.

[1] Not including such easily accessible works as those in the *Rolls* and other standard series (chronicles, episcopal registers, etc.) nor the numerous publications of the *Early English Text Society.* These have been cited with detail in the foot-notes.

.... Registrum Epistolarum Fratris Johannis Peckham.
C. T. Martin, editor. 3 vols.
Rolls Series, 1882-5.

Watton, John(?): Speculum Christiani.
London, 1484.

Wilkins, David: Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae.
4 vols.
Londini, 1737.

(unknown) Exornatorium Curatorum.
London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1520;
Also: Richard Pynson, 1520;
Henry Pepwell, 1530; and
Thomas Godfray, 1532?

.... Quatuor Sermones.
William Caxton, editor.
(Re-printed for the Roxburghe Club).
London, 1883.

.... Speculum Laicorum.
J. Th. Welter, editor.
Paris, 1914.

.... Vetus liber archidiaconi eliensis.
Feltoe, C. L., & Minns, E. H., editors.
(Cambridge Antiquarian Society)
Cambridge, 1917.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES[2]

Capes, W. W.: A History of the English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries;
being vol. iii of *A History of the English Church,* Stephens, W. R. W., and Hunt, William, editors. 9 vols.
London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1920.

Cutts, E. L.: Parish Priests and their People in the Middle Ages in England.
London, 1898. (Also an edition in 1914.)

Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique
Paris-VI, 1932.
s. v. Pecham, Jean:

Dufourcq, Albert: In Fasciscule C: Paul I - Péché.
L'Avenir du Christianisme: vol. vi: 1049-1300.
Fifth edition.
Paris, 1924 (?).

Harnack, Theodosius: Katechetik.
Erlangen, 1882.

[2] Such well-known works as those by Coulton, Gasquet, Leach, Stubbs, *et. al.,* are not listed here. These and others have been cited, with detail, in the footnotes.

Johnstone, Hilda: Archbishop Pecham and the Council of Lambeth of 1281.
In "Essays in Medieval History presented to Thomas Frederick Tout". Manchester, 1925.

Little, A. G.: (The) Grey Friars in Oxford.
(Oxford Historical Society)
Oxford, 1892.

.... Studies in English Franciscan History.
London, 1917.

Lynd(e)wood, William: Provinciale.
Oxford, 1679.

Mandonnet, P.: Siger de Brabant. (In two parts).
In "Les Philosophes Belges", tome vi.
Louvain, 1911.

Messenger, R. E.: Ethical Teachings in the Latin Hymns of Medieval England with Special Reference to the Seven Deadly Sins and the Seven Principal Virtues.
New York: Columbia University Press, 1930.

Owst, G. R.: Preaching in Medieval England.
Cambridge University Press, 1926.

Parkinson, Anthony: Collectanea Anglo-Minoritica.
London, 1726.

Sharp, D. E.: Franciscan Philosophy at Oxford in the Thirteenth Century.
Oxford University Press, 1930.

Articles (selected) :—

Callebaut, André: Jean Pecham, O. F. M., et L'Augustinisme.
In "Archivum Franciscanum Historicum", vol. xviii (1925), pp. 441-72.

Lampen, Willibrord: Jean Pecham, O. F. M., et son Office de la S. Trinité.
In "La France Franciscaine", vol. xi (1928), pp. 211-29.

Little, A. G.: The Franciscan School at Oxford in the Thirteenth Century.
In "Archivum Franciscanum Historicum", vol. xix (1926), pp. 803-74.

Oliger, Livarius: (A review of *Tractatus tres etc.*, with important bibliographical data.)
In "Archivum Franciscanum Historicum", vol. iv (1911), pp. 147-52.

Waugh, W. T.: Archbishop Peckham and Pluralities.
In "English Historical Review", vol. xxviii, (1913), pp. 625-35.

Note.—For a classified bibliographical survey of Twentieth Century studies exhibiting Peckham's contributions to Philosophy, Theology, Religious Education, Homiletics, Canon Law, Franciscan History, Science, Liturgics, and Poetry, see the writer's "Recent Recognition of Peckham", forthcoming in *Church History*, vol. iii (1934).

Addenda et corrigenda

Page 24, line 2: *For* Enysham, *read* Eynsham.

Page 25, note 62: *For* usque ab, *read* usque ad.

Page 46, line 8: *For* 1824, *read* 1284.

Page 54, note 21: *After* remedium, *read* discriminum statuendo praecipimus, ut quilibet sacerdos plebi praesidens, quater in anno, hoc est, semel in qualibet quarta anni, die uno solenni vel pluribus, per se vel per alium exponat populo vulgariter, absque cujuslibet subtilitatis textura fantastica...

Page 59, line 8: *For* encourgaments, *read* encouragements.

Page 75, line 9: *For* decres, *read* decrees.

Page 79, lines 23-24: *For* degrees, *read* decrees.

Page 82, note 5: *For* 1821, *read* 1281.

Page 86, line 14: *For* eucharsitiae, *read* eucharistiae.

Page 91, note 48: *For* pradicta coram parochainis, *read* predicta coram parochianis.

Page 94, note 62: *Omit second line.*

Page 99, line 7: *For* mammals, *read* manuals.

Page 103, line 27: *For* circa, *read* ca.

Page 107, line 23: *Omit* by such a popular leader as Wyclif.

Page 107, note 78: *For* Wycklif, *read* Wyclif.

Page 108, notes 80 and 82: *For* Wycklif, *read* Wyclif.

Page 142, note 4: *Add:* Note also that a Pope, Urban II, addressing Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, admitted that "quasi comparem, velut alterius orbis apostolicum et patriarchum, jure venerandum censeamus" — Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi,* p. 390. (Rolls series, 1884.) Indeed, William of Veraval [Warelwast, Warwest, etc.], later Bishop of Exeter, protested in 1103 to another Pope, Pascal II, that "Angliam peculiarem esse Romanae ecclesiae provintiam."—William of Malmesbury, *De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum,* p. 111. (Rolls series, 1870.)

Page 146, note: *Read:* see the writer's "Recent Recognition of Archbishop Peckham", in *Church History,* Vol. III, No. 2 (June, 1934), pp. 126-45.

Page 150, line 11: *For* Lamebth, *read* Lambeth.

Analysis of Contents

Page

I. *Introduction* 11

II. *Peckham's Educational Work as Archbishop* 18

A. His Injunctions to Monasteries 18
1. Efforts to promote personal morality and religion 18
a. Combatted sins characteristic of monasteries 19
b. Required purgations 20
2. Efforts to improve administrative standards 21
a. Required systematic auditing of accounts 22
b. Forbade extravagance and display 23
c. Required confessions to be made *in loco publico* 24
d. Prohibited worldly pastimes 25
e. Urged appointment of English-speaking priors 26
f. Checked misuse of power of office 26
g. Protested against various instances of laxity 27
3. Efforts to increase reverence and worship 28
a. Forbade shortened services 28
b. Prohibited irreverent customs and ceremonies 28
c. Enjoined frequent reception of the Eucharist 29
d. Required attendance at services 30
e. Forbade display of wares in church 30

B. His Directions to the Secular Clergy 31
1. Efforts to promote personal morality 31
a. Combatted incontinence 32
b. Required purgations 33
2. Efforts to improve the standards of the profession 34
a. Forbade Pluralism and Absenteeism 35
b. Prohibited extortion 36
c. Enjoined alms-giving 36
d. Withheld benefices from ineligibles 38
e. Forbade the wearing of secular clothes 39
3. Efforts to increase reverence and worship 40
a. Enjoined reverence towards the Eucharist 40
b. Urged the celebration of Mass daily 41
c. Promulgated (1287) Articles on Preaching, &c. 41

C. His Reforms at Oxford 44
1. In the Curriculum 44
a. Condemned certain erroneous teaching 44
b. Prescribed additional textbooks 45
2. In the Administration 46
a. Demanded that the teaching be given in Latin 47
b. Restored edifying readings at meals 48

D. His Regulations directly affecting the Laity 49
1. The Constitutions of Lambeth—a "new" minimum of religious instruction 49

2. Other constructive measures 58
a. Required the Viaticum to be available at all hours 59
b. Made the laity responsible for certain "ornaments" 60
c. Upheld the "Right of Sanctuary" 62
d. Allowed the laity to confess to Friars 63
e. Various minor matters:—
(1) Taught respect for one's pledged word 64
(2) Preached a Crusade 64
(3) Granted Indulgences 64
(4) Combatted usury 66
(5) Urged educating Welsh children in England 66
(6) Urged the King to rebuild damaged churches 67
(7) Appointed school teachers 68
3. Restrictive and disciplinary measures 68
a. Forbade servile work on Sunday 68
b. Imposed penalties of great severity 70
c. Combatted idleness 71
d. Condemned certain superstitions 72

E. His relation to preceding legislation and earlier treatises 72
1. Prior legislation 72
a. Fourth Lateran Council, . . 1215 72
b. Council of Oxford, ... 1222 73
c. William de Bleys, ... 1229 73
d. Edmund Rich, ... 1236 73
e. Alexander of Stavenby, . . . 1237 74
f. Council of London, ... 1237 74
g. Robert Grosseteste, ... 1238 74
h. Walter Cantilupe, ... 1240 74
i. Richard de la Wich, ... 1246 75
j. Aegidius of Salisbury, . . . 1256 75
k. Statuta synodalia (Norwich), . 1257 75
l. Boniface of Canterbury, . . . 1261 75
m. Council of London, ... 1268 75
2. Earlier treatises 79
a. *Speculum Sancti Edmundi* 80
b. Grosseteste's *Chasteau d'Amour* 80
c. The *Ayenbite of Inwyt* 80
d. *Sawles Warde* 80
e. Hugh of St. Victor's *De Anima* 80

F. The closing years of Peckham's life 81

III. *Peckham's Influence.* 82

A. Upon Ecclesiastical Legislation: constitutions, injunctions, visitation articles, mandates, &c. 83

			(Conclusiveness of the evidence of Peckham's influence)	
1.	Quivil	1287	Almost certain	83
2.	Winchelsey	1301	Slight	84
3.	Woodloke	1308	Slight	85
4.	Kellow	1312	Slight	85
5.	Grandisson	1335	Highly probable	86
6.	Russell	1350	Slight	86
7.	Thoresby	1357	Almost certain	87
8.	Langham	1364	Probable	88
9.	Wykeham	1385	*Certain*	89
10.	Arundel	1409	*Certain*	89
11.	Stafford	1435	*Certain*	90
12.	Neville	1466	Almost certain	91
13.	Wolsey	1518	Almost certain	92
14.	Henry VIII.	1536	Probable	94
15.	Longland	1537	Probable	94
16.	Edward VI.	1547	Probable	94
17.	First Book of Common Prayer	1549	Probable	96
18.	Elizabeth	1559	Probable	96

B. Clerical Manuals, &c. 98
Latin:—
1. Pupilla Oculi ..... *Certain* 99
2. Speculum Christiani—by Watton .... *Certain* 100
3. Oculus Sacerdotis (and the Cilium Oculi Sacerdotis) ..... *Certain* 101
4. Flos Florum ..... *Certain* 102
5. Regimen Animarum ..... *Certain* 102
6. Manuale Sacerdotum 103
7. Compilatio brevis 104
8-11. Four un-named MSS.: Lamebth 460 *Certain* 104
Add. 24660 . 105
Bodl. 110 ... 105
Merton 217 *Certain* 105
English:—
12. Dan Gaytrige's Sermon 106
13. Lollard Adaptation of *supra* (and the Speculum Vitae Christianiae) 107
14. Instructions for Parish Priests 108
15. Jacob's Well ..... *Certain* 109
16. Speculum Christiani, by Byrde ..... *Certain* 110
17. Exornatorium Curatorum ..... *Certain* 110
18. Quatuor Sermones 111
19-20. Two un-named MSS.:
Camb. Univ. Libr. Dd. XII, 69 .. 112
Linc. Cath. Libr. A. 6. 2. 112

C. School Curricula, &c. 114

IV. Evaluation of Peckham's Importance as a Religious Educator . 116
A. His Work: 116
1. His injunctions to monasteries 116
Extent 116
Educational Soundness 117
Value for Religious Education 117
2. His directions to the secular clergy 118
Extent 118
Educational Soundness 118
Value for Religious Education 118
3. His reforms at Oxford University 119
Extent 119
Educational Soundness 120
Value for Religious Education 120

4. His regulations affecting the Laity 121
Extent 121
Educational Soundness 121
Value for Religious Education 122
a. The Constitutions of Lambeth 122
The prevailing status of preaching 123
The advance made by Peckham 124
The authority of "Constitutions" 126
b. His other constructive measures 127
c. His restrictive and disciplinary measures 130
Appraisal of his Work 131

B. His Influence: 133
1. On later ecclesiastical Legislation 133
Extent 133
Effectiveness 133
2. On Clerical Manuals 134
Extent 134
Effectiveness 137
3. On Curricula, &c. 137
Extent 137
Effectiveness 138

Appraisal of his Influence 138

Appendices

I Variant Spellings of Peckham's Name 141
II. The "Ecclesia Anglicana": A Note on its alleged Independence 142

Bibliography 144

Date Due

JUN 15 1993

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01029 3886